51

The University of Chicago
FOUNDED BY JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER

THE PSEUDO-CICERONIAN CONSOLATIO

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF ARTS
AND LITERATURE IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE
OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

(DEPARTMENT OF LATIN)

BY
EVAN T. SAGE

STANFORD UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
WITHDRAWN

CHICAGO
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
1910

3781
C53S
UNCLASSED
Diss-LA790

The University of Chicago
FOUNDED BY JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER

THE PSEUDO-CICERONIAN CONSOLATIO

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF ARTS
AND LITERATURE IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE
OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

(DEPARTMENT OF LATIN)

BY
EVAN T. SAGE

STANFORD LIBRARY

CHICAGO
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
1910

153570

COPYRIGHT 1910 BY
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Published February 1910

STANFORD LIBRARY

Composed and Printed By
The University of Chicago Press
Chicago, Illinois, U. S. A.

TO

L. S. S. L. E. S.
W. L. S. S. M. S.

IN GRATEFUL ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF SYMPATHY
AND ENCOURAGEMENT

PREFACE

The ultimate origin of this dissertation may be found in the interest in epideictic literature aroused by a seminar study of the *Agricola* of Tacitus under Professor G. L. Hendrickson, then of Chicago, now of Yale. Added to this was the curiosity which any anonymous document must inspire, especially one of literary, historical, or even merely antiquarian interest.

I desire to record my gratitude to the Bibliotecario of the Biblioteca Civica, Bergamo, Italy, for ready and courteous assistance given me while a student there, and later; to Dr. B. L. Ullman, of the University of Chicago, particularly for material gathered by him while abroad; to Professor G. J. Laing and Dr. C. H. Beeson, of the University of Chicago, for timely assistance and valuable criticism; and especially to Professor Hendrickson, at whose suggestion, and under whose direction, the work was done. It is but just to add that the distance and almost continuous separation between us during the progress of the work have deprived it in no small degree of the benefits of his sound judgment and searching criticism, which would have removed many blemishes.

EVAN T. SAGE

UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO
March, 1909

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I append a brief list of the works to which reference is made most frequently, and in most abbreviated form: Schulz *De Ciceronis Consolatione*, Diss. (*Schulz*); Schneider *De Ciceronis Consolatione*, Diss. (*Schneider*); Buresch "Consolationum a Graecis Romanque Scriptarum Historia Critica," in *Leipziger Studien zur kl. Phil.* IX. 5 ff. (*Buresch*). For the *Consolatio* itself, the Nobbe edition was used, chiefly because the text therein is divided into sections. I have used also the editions of Ernesti and Klotz, various older editions, as that in the *Opera* of Sigonius, ed. 1757, and that in the Gothofredus *Cicero* of 1588, and a few of the early editions enumerated on p. 7. Nobbe's text with the exception of some changes in punctuation was followed closely. The sixteenth-century controversial literature was derived mainly from the 1757 edition of Sigonius. The fragments are cited from the Teubner text of Müller. Other bibliographical material will be found in the appropriate places.

CONTENTS

PAGE

INTRODUCTION xi

CHAPTER

I. THE CONSOLATION DOWN TO THE TIME OF CICERO . . 1

II. HISTORY OF THE PSEUDO-CICERONIAN CONSOLATIO . . 7

III. STRUCTURE OF OUR CONSOLATIO 10

IV. AUTHENTICITY OF OUR CONSOLATIO 25

V. CONJECTURES AS TO THE AUTHOR 47

APPENDIX A. CONSOLATIONS AND LAUDATIONS IN THE RENAISSANCE 59

APPENDIX B. CLAUSULAE 62

INTRODUCTION

About the beginning of the year 1583 there was published in Venice, by a certain Vianello, under the name of Cicero, the *Consolatio* we are to study. For a year it was a never-failing topic of discussion, and then it passed from the thoughts of men. Since then references to it have been, with few exceptions, casual and incidental. Despite the magic of the name of Cicero, despite the importance of the consolation in the history of literature, our *Consolatio* is almost unknown. The assumption of spuriousness now universally and tacitly made seemed to lack sufficient basis, and a re-examination of the evidence seemed desirable. Ideally, the question of the authenticity of our *Consolatio* should have been settled at the time of its publication: some scholar in possession of all the necessary facts, and equipped with all the necessary powers of imagination, combination, and divination, would have solved the problem once and for all. When later generations approach such a question, the earlier discussions and assumptions, however futile, inevitably leave a penumbra of unconscious prejudice. Yet these earlier attempts to answer the question are not to be neglected; the illuminating flash may as well come from a scholar of the sixteenth century as from a student of the twentieth. Lacking this ideal condition, the only resource of the student of authenticity is to re-examine, with all possible care, all the evidence it is possible to accumulate, without reference to any assumption of spuriousness, and, if possible, without prejudice therefrom. In the present case, to counteract any such prejudice, the makeshift substitute has been adopted of assuming the document genuine until proved spurious, putting the burden of proof, so to speak, on the prosecution. The resultant attitude of mind is of course only an approximation to the ideal entire impartiality.

I propose first to inquire into the state and quantity of consolatory literature in Cicero's time, to furnish us with a background for further study; second, to examine the external history of our *Consolatio;* third, to attempt to make out its structure and relation to other literature; fourth, to investigate the question of its authenticity, and then, if it proves spurious, to try to assign a date for its composition. The principle of work and of presentation has been to consider all the evidence possible, and to present typical specimens when the bulk of material of one sort was prohibitive; to apply all the tests that could be devised; and finally, to submit the evidence and the results in such a form that the reader's conclusions may not be unduly influenced by mine. In this way alone, it seems to me, may real progress be made toward the solution of the problem.

CHAPTER I

THE CONSOLATION DOWN TO THE TIME OF CICERO

The student of any Roman literary type is of course interested in the sources, not only of the ideas presented, but also of the form chosen for the presentation. Obviously such a type as the consolation is intimately related to certain other types like the laudation, the threnos, etc., and properly should not be separated from them in a complete study of sources. The connections of any species of literature are so numerous and so widespread that a special investigation is necessary for each, and no casual statement can be adequate and complete. We may, however, indicate in a general way the affiliations of the consolation, and so form some idea of the possible sources, though here some other elements must be taken into account. We shall in the present discussion not concern ourselves much with the identification of sources in particular, especially since, as the following will bring out, such an identification may easily be, and usually has been, carried too far. It is true that for an occasional distinctive point of view a definite philosophical provenance may be made out, sometimes with certainty, but in a field like that of consolation, the ideas are of such universal character that a high degree of uncertainty with regard to origin is inevitable.

In connection with the problem of the sources of Cicero's *Consolatio*, that of the sources of the *Tusculans* becomes of some interest. The exact relationship between the two it is probably now impossible to determine: the general similarity of subject, the frequent references to the *Consolatio* in the *Tusculans*, and other data compel the universal conclusion that a connection, more or less close, does exist. Yet the question of the sources of the *Tusculans* is too complicated, and the promised results too meager, to make a full discussion here profitable. The question has been fully debated in well-known articles by Corssen, Heine, Schmekel, Kühner, Reinhardt, Kayser, Hirzel, Tischer, Rohde, and Buresch. The most recent contribution is that of Rubrichi, in *Rivista di Storia Antica*, N. S. XI. 100 ff., who believes that Plato is the direct source for the principal arguments, while Chrysippus, Plutarch (!), Herodotus, Xenophon, and others were drawn upon for illustrative material. The perusal of these conflicting interpretations does not tend toward simplifying the problem, nor is it possible that new light will be thrown upon it. However, a concrete example of Cicero's method of attacking a philosophical problem may be of some

interest, both for the *Tusculans* and for the *Consolatio*. Pliny (*N. H.*, pref. 22) quotes from Cicero's *Consolatio* the words, "Crantorem sequor," and the fact is repeated by Hieronymus *Ep.* lx. 5 (Migne I. 592). In Pliny this has all the characteristics of a direct quotation, and it doubtless is so, as all the editors of the Fragments from Patricius down have believed (Sigonius seems to have omitted it from his collection, though he refers to it in his commentary). This would seem at first to be decisive, and has been considered so, but wrongly, as Buresch, p. 39, Schneider, p. 9, Schulz, pp. 22, 26 and n. 2, have hinted on general grounds. The interpretation of the quotation comes naturally enough from Cicero himself. Cicero gives us a clear account of his method of work in two letters to Atticus (xii. 21. 5; xii. 14. 3). In the former he writes as follows: "neque tamen progredior longius quam mihi doctissimi homines concedunt, quorum scripta omnia quaecumque sunt in eam sententiam non legi solum, quod ipsum erat fortis aegroti, accipere medicinam, sed in mea etiam scripta transtuli." He says practically the same thing in the second letter: "nihil enim de maerore minuendo scriptum ab ullo est, quod non domi tuae legerim." Cf. *Tusc.* iii. 31. 76. In this passage Cicero has just related the different methods of different schools, and continues: "Sunt etiam qui haec omnia genera consolandi conligant—alius enim alio modo movetur—ut fere nos in *Consolatione* omnia in consolationem unam coniecimus." Whatever we may think of Hieronymus, there is no reason to discredit the statement of Pliny, barring the possibility that he used our *Consolatio*, which contains the words. Crantor's book was so popular that Cicero undoubtedly used it, especially as he tells us that he had read it (*Acad.* ii. 44. 135). What then does *sequi* mean? Let Cicero answer: *De off.* i. 2. 6: "*Sequemur* igitur hoc quidem tempore et hac in quaestione potissimum Stoicos, non ut interpretes, sed, ut solemus, e fontibus eorum iudicio arbitrioque nostro, quantum quoque modo videbitur, hauriemus." Cf. *De off.* ii. 17. 60: "Panaetius, quem multum in his libris *secutus sum*, non interpretatus," and *De off.* iii. 2. 7: "Panaetius, quem . . . . *secuti sumus*." If we may safely draw conclusions, Cicero in his *Consolatio* used Crantor only as a general guide, probably adding material of his own at will, particularly examples from Roman history, and modifying from other sources. Is it possible that the method of the *Tusculans* was essentially the same? Finally let me commend to students of the question *Tusc.* iv. 4. 7: "Sed defendat quod quisque sentit; sunt enim iudicia libera; nos institutum tenebimus, nullisque unius disciplinae legibus adstricti, quibus in philosophia necessario pareamus, quid sit in quaque re maxime probabile, semper requiremus."

The history of the consolation has been thoroughly studied from most points of view by Buresch, and no repetition of his work is to be attempted here. We may however inquire into the state of consolatory literature in the time of Cicero, to learn what material was available for him, and what predecessors he had had in this field of activity. A long line of philosophers had given their names to essays on this and related subjects, among whom the academician Crantor had won the greatest fame. Probably he deserves more than the passing notice he has received. Among his most famous, and perhaps deservedly famous, works, was the *De luctu*, which won for him high praise in antiquity. See Cicero *Acad.* ii. 44. 135: "Legimus omnes Crantoris veteris Academici de luctu; est enim non magnus, verum aureolus, et, ut Tuberoni Panaetius praecipit, ad verbum ediscendus libellus;" and Diog. Laert. iv. 27. Crantor would seem to have summed up in this essay all that previous generations of philosophers had accomplished in the line of consolation, if we may safely reason from a certain eclecticism which seems discernible (cf. Kayser *De Crantore Academico*, Heidelberg Diss., 1841, p. 3; Martha *Études morales sur l'antiquité*, p. 142). It was therefore well adapted to such a use as that to which Cicero, and doubtless others now unknown, put it, not only from its content, but from the charm of its style.

But Crantor was only one of a long line of philosophers who had essayed to console others for their misfortunes. It was not at all strange that the philosophers should have engaged so freely in the work of consolation, considering the part which philosophy played in ancient life. It was to the philosopher that one naturally looked for such spiritual or quasi-spiritual assistance, and he of course tried to meet such a demand. Not many people in all probability would have listened to such advice as that of Carcinus (frag. 7 Nauck):

> πολλῶν γὰρ ἀνθρώποισι φάρμακον κακῶν
> σιγή, μάλιστα δ' ἐστὶ σώφρονος τρόπου.

It was natural too that the different schools, after the time when schools came into existence, and different philosophers always, should have approached the subject in different ways, to meet the varying needs of their clients, and in accordance with the points of view which their systems imposed upon them. See Cicero *Tusc.* iii. 31. 76: "Sunt qui unum officium consolantis putent, malum illud omnino non esse, ut Cleanthi placet; sunt qui non magnum malum, ut Peripatetici; sunt qui abducant a malis ad bona, ut Epicurus; sunt qui satis putent ostendere nihil inopinati accidisse, ut Cyrenaici. Chrysippus autem caput esse censet in consolando

detrahere illam sententiam maerenti si se officio fungi putet iusto atque debito." It is not our purpose to inquire whether these different styles of arguments deserve the derisive comment of Martha (*op. cit.*, p. 162): "Chaque école se moquait des arguments de l'autre, et il faut convenir qu'en cela, en cela seulement, elles avaient toutes raison." Nor need we investigate too closely the differences in these methods of treatment, as we are not attempting a definite assignment of sources. The reasons for these variations are easy enough to understand. The range of ideas that are properly consolatory is small, and before the change in the point of view brought about by Christianity, was smaller still, but numerous slight differences in the form or thought were possible for different individual reasons—*alius alio modo movetur*. Therefore it is entirely natural that there should have been these differences, especially as the formation of independent schools aided in bringing about a difference of alignment. Despite the debate among them, the philosopher was the most valued consoler, though he was not the only professional offerer of consolation. For the rhetoricians at an early date made incursions into this field, as we know of Antiphon from Philostratus *Vit. Soph.* i. 15. We have other evidence of activity of this sort on the part of the early rhetoricians: cf. Cicero *Tusc.* i. 48. 116: "Alcidamas quidem rhetor antiquus in primis nobilis, scripsit etiam laudationem mortis, quae constat ex enumeratione humanorum malorum; cui rationes eae, quae exquisitius a philosophis conliguntur, defuerunt, ubertas orationis non defuit." From this it would appear that the rhetoricians were less favored than their rivals. The next sentence in Cicero shows with some clearness their favorite arguments: "clarae vero mortes pro patria oppetitae non solum gloriosae rhetoribus, sed etiam beatae videri solent." Early rhetorical interest in the forms of encomiastic literature is also amply vouched for by the *Euagoras* of Isocrates. Possibly consolation and eulogy formed part of the regular courses in encomium in the schools. Certainly some of the consolatory topics did find place. Cf. Cicero *Tusc.* i. 47. 113: "Deorum immortalium iudicia solent in scholis proferre de morte, nec vero ea fingere ipsi, sed Herodoto auctore, aliisque pluribus." Then follow the stock examples, Cleobis and Bito, Trophonius and Agamedes, etc. This is designated in the preceding section as an *epilogus rhetorum*. For later times there is abundant evidence in favor of this suggestion—the presumption afforded by the *Suasoriae*, the treatise of Menander, the clever *praeteritiones* of Hieronymus. But not only philosophers and rhetoricians offered consolation, but also an occasional poet, like Antimachus, who, to console himself for the death of Lyde, wrote an account in two or three books of the calamities of mythical heroes and heroines.

See Ps.-Plut. *Cons. ad Apoll.* 9, and Croiset *Histoire de la littérature grecque* III. 653 ff. This may serve to discredit somewhat Cicero's assumption of originality in self-consolation.

In the nature of things the ideas that are used for consolation find frequent expression in literature that is not primarily consolatory. In a literature so intimately connected with death and the thought of death as the Greek, it is inevitable that such thoughts be frequently expressed. On the other hand, the number of consolatory ideas was small, and originality would become more and more difficult as time went on. This paucity of ideas might, and doubtless did, have two sets of consequences: ingenious variation of expression, and a tendency to crystallize into formulae.

Thucydides has summed up once for all the real motive of eulogy (ii. 45. 1): *τὸν γὰρ οὐκ ὄντα ἅπας εἴωθεν ἐπαινεῖν.* Inseparable from this is the desire to console the living, so we find the origin of these related customs in human nature. As these experiences and desires are older than professed and conscious philosophy and rhetoric, so laudation and consolation doubtless existed in earlier times, though philosophers and rhetoricians soon made them their province. It may even be questioned whether the character, if not the form, of the ideas was not much the same in the earlier and the later periods, on account of the difficulty of finding new arguments. The soldier consoles the Widow of Ephesus (Petronius III. 8) with the same arguments that are used in the *Tusculan Disputations*, and they are sufficiently plausible, if not entirely unsophisticated and artless. Therefore the differences which mark the different philosophical schools need not disturb us: we are not now attempting a philosophical analysis of ideas, and the great variety of places in which consolatory notions are presented precludes any thoroughgoing and convincing assignment of sources. It is probable that even within a sect complete harmony is not to be looked for; there might always be eclectics like Crantor, and Panaetius is said to have denied the immortality of the soul (Cicero *Tusc.* i. 32. 79). On the other hand, men without definite philosophical affiliations, and even without conscious philosophical thought, might on single points agree with the teachings of the philosophers.

Now it is true that Crantor might furnish a convenient source for ready reference, and have the additional virtue of a pleasing style, but it can hardly be true that he made any great innovations in the material or the form of the consolation, and what we know of the character of his work (see above, p. 3) does not create an impression of originality. If, therefore, the greater part of the material was already accessible, as seems to have been the case, the theory that Crantor was Cicero's only source is built on entirely inade-

quate grounds. Equally unjustifiable is the attempt to reconstruct Cicero's *Consolatio* or Crantor's essay by choosing what is common to the *Tusculans* and the *Consolatio ad Apollonium*. We have seen (p. 2, above) that what looked like a direct statement of source required interpretation, and it seems in the highest degree unsafe to assume that any single document is the only source for another. The ideas expressed by Crantor must have been already familiar to educated people, and no Greek authority can with entire safety be regarded as the immediate source of the Roman sepulchral inscriptions. It may well be true that Crantor was Cicero's principal authority: the theory that he was the only authority seems clearly out of harmony with the existing evidence, and should not be used as a foundation for further reasoning.

As any speculation on the other sources probably employed by Cicero would be mere conjecture in most cases, we shall not attempt to assign particular sources, nor to assert that any given author was or was not used by him. The danger of such theorizing has, I hope, been sufficiently emphasized in the preceding pages. The eclecticism of Cicero in writing his *Consolatio* is perhaps sufficient warning.

It is, then, unnecessary, at least, to assume that resemblance in form of expression of a consolatory idea implies a connection. Both may have a common source, or both may draw upon the common stock of philosophy or rhetoric. We shall therefore in the following pages generally avoid statements as to the existence of a relation, by reason of the conviction that such a procedure is not justified by the facts.

CHAPTER II

HISTORY OF THE PSEUDO-CICERONIAN CONSOLATIO

It would be interesting to reproduce in full the discussion of this document since its publication, but that is manifestly impossible. Whether it existed prior to 1583 it is as yet impossible to say, and for that reason it was ignored in chap. i. The consideration of that and related questions must be left for a later chapter. Our present undertaking is simply to give a brief account of the known history of the book, and the discussion it provoked.

The exact date of the supposed discovery cannot be ascertained. It is commonly said to have been 1583, though asserted by some (e. g., Scharff in his *Observatio*) to have been as early as 1581. Riccoboni wrote in his *Iudicium*, dated iv. Kal. Mai. 1583, of its appearance "superiori proximo anno," and Sigonius in his reply (undated but surely not much later) used the expression "superioribus mensibus." That the date was earlier than 1583 may be inferred from the fact that Lipsius had pronounced his opinion as early as January, 1583 (*Epistt. cent.* I, Misc. 99). Scharff was further confused by his belief that Gulielmus, who, as we shall see later, played an important part in the debate, died in 1580, but the exact date of the discovery is of consequence mainly in the interpretation of a difficult letter of Sigonius to which reference will be made later (p. 48). The first edition appears to be dated 1583; it was published in Venice by a certain Vianello, an "ignobilis librarius" of whom little else is known. Other editions followed in quick succession, at Paris, Leyden, Strassburg, Frankfort, and elsewhere, and a French translation by Benoist du Troncy in 1584. See Deschamps *Essai bibliog. sur Cicéron*, p. 104; Scharff *op. cit.* An immediate interest was aroused. The scholars of the Renaissance, from Petrarch down, had sought long and earnestly for the *Consolatio* but without success. The enthusiasm the announcement of the discovery evoked may well be imagined. But soon there were suspicions, and no lack of suspicious circumstances. Letters of Vianello and Sigonius are of interest in this connection. Early in May, 1583, Vianello wrote to ask Sigonius' opinion, and adds "ob eam rem sine ulla Praefatione vel Epistola editus est, ut unicuique liberum iudicium relinqueretur censendi de eo, quicquid visum fuisset." Sigonius replied almost immediately, that he believed the book genuine, or at least the work "alicuius praestantissimi alterius." "Quod autem," he continues, "ubi inventus et a quo editus

sit, non adiectum sit, multi haudquaquam rudes et imperiti, fucum propterea factum esse verentur. Quare ad eorum advertendum errorem elegante admodum feceris, si ipse totam huiusce rei historiam comiter hominibus exposueris, quo facto, spero me facillime assecuturum, ut incredulorum istorum impetum non solum sustineam, sed etiam felicissime comprimam." (Both letters are in Sigonius *Opera*, ed. 1757, VI. 883). Cf. another letter from Sigonius to Vianello (*Opp.* VI. 931): "Reliquum est ut et tu mihi persolvas, quod litteris ad me vernacula lingua scriptis promisisti, te unde hic liber erutus sit, prolaturum, aut eum, a quo haec accepisti, causam suam, quam indigne oppugnari conqueritur, suscepturum, ac iustae omniumque cupiditati satisfacturum." The promise of Vianello seems never to have been kept, and the defense was then harder. Yet if this was the cause of the first suspicions, it was not admitted. The acceptance seems to have been at first unanimous, and the reasons for the change are not perfectly clear. The failure of Vianello to produce the MS would seem to us suspicious. Riccoboni, however, who appears to have been the first to challenge the document, scarcely mentions this, though Muretus and Orsini insisted on seeing the MS before believing. Motives are hard to find. Professional jealousy seems to have played a part. De Nolhac publishes in *La bibliothèque de Fulvio Orsini*, pp. 73 ff., also in "Piero Vettorio et Carolo Sigonio, Correspondance avec Fulvio Orsini" in *Studi e Documenti di Storia e Diritto* X. 147, a letter of Sigonius to Orsini, dated June 25, 1583: "De Gratia ella mi scriva anchora l'opinione Sua sopra la *Consolatione*, percio che io tengo che sia di Cicerone et odo di ogni parte che si tiene il contrario. Onde sono sforzato a difendere questa opinione per honor della cathedra di Bologna, poi che quella di Padoa ha sententiato il contrario." This somewhat polemic tone may be observed in another letter to Orsini, dated July 28, 1583 (De Nolhac *Correspondance*, etc., pp. 148 ff.). The discoverer, he says, was willing to make known the circumstances of the find, and adds, "Io aggiungo a V. S. che a me le oppositione fatte et da Roma et da Padoa, et da altri luoghi sono parse cosi leggiere che per compassione di questo libro ho preso la sua difesa . . . . io no conosco persona, a questi di atta a fingere cosi bene, et quando lo vedro, lo credero." How far the discussion spread is unknown, and many details are vague. Sigonius seems to have been rather unfortunate in his advocacy, while Riccoboni was reinforced by Gulielmus, Lipsius, and others. Naturally enough, the suggestion was soon made, perhaps first by Gulielmus *Assertio adversus C. Sigonium*, p. 113, etc., that Sigonius himself was the author, or had helped the author. This charge was answered by the statement that the MS was three hundred years old, though nothing was done

with regard to publishing it. The debate grew hotter and hotter, Sigonius' *Orator* following Riccoboni's *Iudicium*, *Accusator* finding a ready answer in *Defensor*, personalities sometimes finding place, though Riccoboni tactfully asserted that he had no reference to Sigonius, but to the anonymous author, three centuries earlier. The proprieties of debate were also well observed when Riccoboni, taking up Sigonius' eulogistic characterization of the author, pointed out the appropriateness of the compliments to Sigonius himself, adding that he personally believed the book so bad that Sigonius could not possibly have written it. The futility of such debate was naïvely confessed by Riccoboni when, in his *Defensor*, he makes Sigonius say: "Sentias tu quicquid velis: ego quoque idem faciam." The theory of a Sigonian origin found favor. Lipsius (*Epistt. cent.* I, Misc. 66) could easily recognize in it "illam Sigoneitatem," though ten years later he was ready to retract and admit that the authorship was to him still a mystery (*Epistt. ad It. et Hisp.* 14). The debate was finally terminated by the death of Sigonius in 1584, hastened, some said, by his chagrin at being found out, and a rumor found currency that on his deathbed he had confessed the forgery. See a letter of Latinus Latinius, referred to by Ellis *Cl. Rev.* VII. 197, and quoted by De Nolhac *Correspondance*, etc., p. 149, n. 5. This theory was the prevailing one as late as 1860: cf. Menzinus *De literatorum hominum invidia*, Florence, 1675; Renouard *Annales de l'imprimerie des Aldes*, 3d ed., Paris, 1834; Meier in an address of 1840 (*Opusc.* II. 266, n. 23); Schulz, p. 5; and has recently been revived by Farrer in his book on *Literary Forgeries*. He contributes no new arguments, but considers that Tiraboschi proved that Sigonius was the author. The general trend of opinion, however, so far as one may judge, is against this theory. The detailed arguments for and against it, in so far as they cannot be inferred from the preceding sketch, must be left to a later chapter, where will be considered also the other opinions which have been expressed, viz., the ascription to Vianello, the attempt of Ellis to refer it back to ancient times, and the interesting conjecture to which Schulz devotes a chapter of his dissertation, that the author was Gasparino Barzizza. The assumption of spuriousness thus tacitly made has as yet of course no evidential support, except that afforded by the suspicious character of the history of the document.

CHAPTER III

STRUCTURE OF OUR CONSOLATIO

While provision was made for the consolation in the encomiastic programmes, as we can see from Menander, it happens that our extant specimens usually fail to reveal in any clear way the presence of the encomiastic topics, but rather fall into the less formal arrangement which we can infer from Cicero. See *Tusc.* iii. 31. 75: "Haec igitur officia sunt consolantium, tollere aegritudinem funditus, aut sedare, aut detrahere quam plurimum, aut supprimere, nec pati manare longius, aut ad alia traducere;" and cf. *Tusc.* iii. 32. 77: "Erit igitur in consolationibus prima medicina, docere aut nullum malum esse, aut admodum parvum; altera, et de communi condicione vitae, et proprie, si quid sit de ipsius qui maereat, disputandum; tertia, summam esse stultitiam frustra confici maerore, cum intelligas nihil posse profici." Schanz (*De incerti poetae consolatione ad Liviam*, p. 19) gives a sufficiently accurate list of the groups of ideas frequently found associated in consolations: "Patientia et constantia; Consolatio per exempla; Mors mala solvit; Memoriae decus; Funerum magnificentia; Immortalitas." Such a list is, when liberally interpreted, broad enough to cover practically the whole ground. It does not follow, of course, that every idea in a given consolation must or can be referred to one of these categories, or that all of these are to be found in every consolation.

In this chapter the effort is made to show how thoroughly this *Consolatio* embodies the usual topics of consolations, not by classifying the ideas according to the above or any other scheme, but by pointing out the occurrence of ideas, similar in form and content, in other pieces of literature. I should wish at the outset to be understood as denying that a relation necessarily exists between two documents expressing a similar idea in similar language (cf. above, p. 6): there may be in particular cases a relation, but a general assumption is unsafe. I simply desire to show the prevalence of these ideas in literature, and to indicate some of the sources from which a writer in a later age might have derived inspiration and assistance. No attempt has been made to collect all the examples of the occurrence of a given notion. Such a task would have been almost endless. It is hoped, however, that a sufficiently wide range of literature has been covered to show the extent to which the consolatory ideas permeate ancient literature. The Roman sepulchral inscriptions, which have been discussed by Lier in a series of articles in *Philologus*, Vols. LXII and LXIII, by Cagnat *Rev. de Phil.*

XIII. 51 ff., and by Tolman in a contemporaneous publication, are here, in general, intentionally omitted. The same is true of the Greek inscriptions, which are discussed somewhat by Tolman.

Let us begin the analysis of our *Consolatio:*

1. Quamquam recentibus morbis medicinam adhibere vetant sapientes.[1]

Cf. *Tusc.* iv. 29. 63: "quodque vetat Chrysippus, ad recentes quasi tumores animi remedium adhibere." The passage was used by Riccoboni in his *Iudicium*, to prove the spuriousness of our *Consolatio*, the indications being the substitution of *morbis* for *tumores*, of *medicinam* for *remedium*, and by the omission of *quasi*. For the use of a similar figure, cf. Seneca *Cons. ad Marc.* 1. 3; Ps.-Plut. *Cons. ad Apoll.* 1.

The author then proceeds to point out the advantages of having the mind free from care, and so better able to perform its proper functions. Consolation is one means of securing this state of mind. The works of Theophrastus, Xenocrates, and Crantor are mentioned particularly in this connection.

The third has been discussed sufficiently for our purposes in chap. i. All are well known from other sources, and are discussed in Buresch, *passim.*

Forced to such a course by the death of his daughter, multa quae ab illis vel acute cogitata, vel eleganter enuntiata sunt, ad dolorem nostrum abstergendum colligemus. 5. Self-consolation is most difficult, but may this help others too, as all must endure the same fate, according to human nature. Qui enim hominem se esse agnoscit, hominisque sibi nomen vindicat, cur ea, quae hominis maxime propria sunt, recusare ac reicere audeat? 6. Atque hic locus a Theophrasto egregie tractatus et perpolitus est, itemque a Xenocrate: quorum uterque eos, qui communes casus recusant, imprudentiae atque iniustitiae condemnat; alter etiam dis ipsis adversos non dubitat appellare.

One of the commonest notions is that all are equal before death, that misfortune comes to all alike, and may be escaped by none. Associated with this is the belief in the essential mortality of man, which renders him liable to misfortune, disease, and death. The idea that no one can escape death is especially common. A convenient summary is furnished by *Cons. ad Liviam* 443: "Sed rigidum ius est, et inevitabile mortis." Cf. Cicero's consolatory letter to Titius (*Ad fam.* v. 16. 2): "est autem consolatio pervulgata . . . . homines nos ut esse meminerimus ea lege natos, ut omnibus telis fortunae proposita sit vita nostra, neque esse recusandum, quo minus ea, qua nati sumus, condicione vivamus." Cf. *Tusc.* iii. 33. 79: "Ne illa

[1] English or Latin words or passages in this chapter in reduced type are summaries, paraphrases, or quotations of the text. Comments and illustrations are not so reduced.

quidem firmissima consolatio est, quamquam et usitata est et saepe prodest: Non tibi hoc soli." That no one can escape the fate of man is a frequent thought: *Ad fam.* iv. 5. 4; Hieron. *Epistt.* 39. 3 (Migne I. 468); Seneca *De rem. fort.* ii. 1; *Cons. ad Marc.* 9. 5; *Cons. ad Polyb.* 14. 2; Petron. 111. 8; Stat. *Silv.* ii. 1. 208 ff.; Pliny *Epistt.* i. 12. 2; viii. 5. 3; Cicero *Cato Mai.* 19. 67; 20. 74; and such expressions in the inscriptions as "tu qui legis memento te esse hominem; vale": Bücheler 71. Somewhat more fancifully stated are Catullus' references to Hades: "Illuc unde negant redire quemquam" (3. 12); *Cons. ad Liviam* 357 ff., with which cf. Petron. 121. 117 ff.; and Horace *Car.* ii. 3. 25 ff. In Greek the idea is equally common. Some specimens follow. Interesting as a favorite quotation of Crantor, and therefore probably in his *De luctu*, is the following: *οἴμοι· τί δ' οἴμοι; θνητά τοι πεπόνθαμεν* (Eur. *Beller.*, frg. 302 N; cf. Diog. Laert. iv. 26). That this formed a topic in Crantor's book is vouched for by *Cons. ad Apoll.* 6: *τοῦ δὴ χάριν ἐτραπόμεθα ἰδεῖρο; ἵν' εἰδείημεν ὅτι καινὸν ἀτυχεῖν οὐδὲν ἀνθρώπῳ ἀλλὰ πάντες ταὐτὸ πεπόνθαμεν.* Cf. an inscription of Amorgos *BCH.* XV. 574. 27 ff., with which cf. *ibid.*, pp. 577, 586, and 588, and Rohde *Psyche*, p. 628, n. 3; a quotation from Menander in *Cons. ad Apoll.* 5; Lysias *Epitaphios* 77, cf. Schneider, p. 29; Theogn. 1187 ff. Bergk; Kaibel *Epigrammata Graeca ex lapidibus conlecta* 567. 1; Eur. *Androm.* 1270 ff.; *Phoen.* 1763; *Iliad* vi. 488; *Cons. ad Apoll.* 15; etc. Occasionally we may hear a second Solon,

> *θνητῶν δὲ μηδεὶς μηδέν' ὄλβιόν ποτε*
> *κρίνῃ, πρὶν αὐτὸν εὖ τελευτήσαντ' ἴδῃ.*
>
> —Dionysius *Leda*, frg. 3 N.

Sometimes the survivor is advised to bear his misfortunes with courage: e. g., in the inscription of Amorgos referred to above, and Cicero's consolation to Sittius (*Ad fam.* v. 17. 3): "communem incertumque casum . . . . sapienter ferres."

7. This subject has been discussed by many. Sed ego Crantorem sequor, cuius legi brevem illum quidem, sed aureum et, ut Panaetio placuit, ad verbum ediscendum de luctu librum, quo acute universam doloris medicinam complexus est.

Cf. Cicero *Acad.* ii. 44. 135, quoted on p. 3, above.

Sed humanae naturae incommoda ita diligenter et accurate expressit, ut, quasi luendorum scelerum causa nasci homines et in hanc lucem ingredi, possis agnoscere.

The last sentence has been universally accepted as a fragment of the genuine *Consolatio* on the authority of Lactantius *Inst.* iii. 18. 18: "Quid

Ciceroni faciemus? qui cum in principio *Consolationis* suae dixisset luendorum scelerum causa nasci homines, iteravit id ipsum postea quasi obiurgans eum, qui vitam non poenam esse putet." The sentence is repeated in sec. 28, thus fitting in with the statement of Lactantius. For interpretations of the relationship and its bearing on the question of authenticity, see below, p. 41.

8. The author then begins an enumeration of the various misfortunes appropriate and appertaining to the different *aetates*, *infantia*, *pueritia*, *adolescentia*, *constans aetas*, of which the author himself is a fair representative, *senectus*.

A similar arrangement may be seen in the *Axiochus* 366 D. ff., though less extensive.

18. Having disposed thus of the *aetates*, he turns to the *genera hominum*, beginning with kings. Of these Dionysius is a good example. They have ever the worries of the kingship, and can never find peace of mind. Opposed to this class is the *infimum genus*, which has the lot its name implies. Sharing the troubles of both the others is the *genus mediocre*. 23. The condition of women is no better, but perhaps worse, for they have as much trouble as men, and less strength to bear it. They suffer with their parents and husbands, as Tullia did. 28. Nostra enim, quae dicitur vita, mors est, nec umquam vivit animus, nisi, compage solutus corporis liber aeternitate potiatur.

Cf. *Tusc.* i. 31. 75: "Haec quidem vita mors est;" and *Somn. Scip.* 3. 6. That the body is a prison is an idea of frequent occurrence, e. g., Cicero *Tusc.* i. 30. 74; *Cato Mai.* 21. 77; Ambrosius *De excessu fratris* ii. 20, cf. Schenkl "Zu Ciceros Consolatio" in *Wiener Studien* XVI. 45.

29. Then follow the stories of Cleobis and Bito, Trophonius and Agamedes.

These, as we noted above, p. 4, were part of the rhetorical common stock. The Cleobis story is told by Valerius Maximus v. 4, Ext. 4; *Axiochus* 367 C; Menander 414, 1 Spengel; *Cons. ad Apoll.* 14; *Tusc.* i. 47. 113. The second story is also widespread: *Axioch. loc. cit.; Tusc. loc. cit.; Cons. ad Apoll. loc. cit.*, etc.

31. Death is the end of a miserable life, and a means of escape from future ills.

This also is extremely common. See *Ad fam.* v. 16. 4: "Non mehercule quemquam audivi hoc gravissimo et pestilentissimo anno adulescentulum aut puerum mortuum, qui mihi non a dis immortalibus ereptus ex his miseriis atque ex iniquissima condicione vitae videretur;" Eur. *Antig.*, frg. 176 N: *θάνατος γὰρ ἀνθρώποισι νεικέων τέλος ἔχει.* Cf. also Soph. *Philoc.*, frg. 636 N; Aesch. *Iket.* 802 ff.; Kaibel *op. cit.* 595. 4; *Axioch.* 367 BC; Anacreon, frg. 51 B; Hieron. *Epistt.* 60. 17 (Migne I. 601); Stob. *Flor.* 120, 27 Gaisford; and an anonymous poem attributed to Aesopus

in *Anth. Pal.* x. 123. Cf. also Schenkl *loc. cit.* The following goes one step farther: Χαίρει τις, Θεόδωρος ἐπεὶ θάνον· ἄλλος ἐπ' αὐτῷ χαιρήσει· θανάτῳ πάντες ὀφειλόμεθα (Simon. 122 B = *Anth. Pal.* x. 105).

32. The Thracian custom of mourning birth is next referred to.

This was another of the consolatory commonplaces. Cf. *Cons. ad Apoll.* 22; Ambrosius *De excessu fratris* ii. 5; Val. Max. ii. 6; 12; 13; Schenkl *op. cit.*, p. 44.

36. Not to be born is best, but second to that is to die as soon as possible.

This is illustrated by the story of Silenus and Midas. See also *Tusc.* i. 48. 114; *Cons. ad Apoll.* 27; Lact. *Inst.* iii. 19. 13 (here quoted directly as a fragment); Ausonius *De ambig. vitae* 50; Theogn. 425 B; Stob. *Flor.* 98. 27; 57 Gaisford; Ambrosius *op. cit.* ii. 30; Schenkl *op. cit.*, p. 45; Schneider, p. 21. Perhaps the most interesting of these is the passage in Ambrosius, who attributes the sentiment to Solomon.

38. Although what follows death is not our concern, but that of the gods (for how will they who care for the living forget the dead?), let us consider that question briefly. One of two things must be true: death brings unconsciousness, or it transfers us to some other place. If the former is true, and death is like sleep, it is a blessing; if the latter, what is better or more pleasant than to be forever with our departed friends? That will be true life.

Death and sleep are frequently compared, e. g., *Cons. ad Apoll.* 12, on the authority of Socrates; *Cato Mai.* 22. 80; *Iliad* xiv. 231, etc.; Kaibel *op. cit.* 559. 7; 101. 4; 202. 1; 204. 7, etc.; Gorgias *ap.* Aelian *Var. hist.* ii. 35; Anaxagoras *ap.* Stob. *Flor.* 120. 19 G; cf. Rohde *Psyche* 80. 1 and 674. 2. The second idea, of association with those who have gone before, suggests much of the ancient thought regarding the life after death: Seneca *Cons. ad Marc.* 25. 1: "deinde ad excelsa sublatus inter felices currit animas, Scipiones Catonesque, interque contemptores vitae et mortis beneficio liberos." Cf. Stat. *Silv.* ii. 6. 98 ff.; *Cato Mai.* 23. 84; Theocr. *Epigr.* 7. 3 (= *Anth. Pal.* vii. 659). For a fuller discussion of immortality in our *Consolatio*, see below, p. 21 (sec. 152).

41. Quod certe fortis est aegroti, non solum accipere, sed etiam exquirere, medicinam.

Cf. *ad Att.* xii. 21. 5: "quod ipsum erat fortis aegroti, accipere medicinam."

42. Death is common to mankind, and therefore not to be grieved. Immoderate grief is base, unjust, and unmanly, and tears accomplish nothing.

That grief is useless is frequently stated, e. g., by Petronius 111. 8; Seneca *Cons. ad Polyb.* 2. 1; *Cons. ad Liviam* 427, 428; Propertius iv. 11. 4;

Iliad xxiv. 128 ff.; *Anacreontea* 34. 9 ff.; Soph. *Incert.*, frg. 865 N; *Cons. ad Apoll.* 19; etc. One may perhaps recognize Stoic influence in the thought that grief is not worthy of a man. The poets sometimes represent the dead themselves as urging the futility of grief, e. g., Propertius iv. ii. 1; Ovid *Fasti* ii. 505 ff.; and from such sources, perhaps, the suggestion was adopted by the composers of epitaphs, numerous examples of which are quoted by Lier *Phil.* LXIII. 55 ff. A single example is *manes parcite iam luctu sollicitare meos*, *Bücheler* 1198. Ordinarily the attitude toward the display of grief is that indicated by the references just given, but occasionally a moderate degree of feeling is applauded, e. g., Cicero *Ad Brutum* i. 9. 2: "ne id ipsum carere omni sensum doloris sit miserius quam dolere, sed ut modice ceteris utile est, ita tibi necesse est;" and *Odyssey* iv. 195 ff. Of the same sort is the familiar passage from Solon (frg. 21 B): Μηδέ μοι ἄκλαυστος θάνατος μόλοι, ἀλλὰ φίλοισιν ποιήσωιμι θανὼν ἄλγεα καὶ στοναχάς.

44. Let us be of good courage, for the death of friends is not the first misfortune for any of us, and grief is unjust. Natura enim usuram nobis vitae dedit, tamquam pecuniae, nulla praefinita die.

Cf. *Tusc.* i. 39. 93: "At ea (*sc.* natura) quidem dedit usuram vitae tamquam pecuniae, nulla praestituta die;" *CIL.* VI. 3580: "debitum naturae persolvit;" Seneca *De rem. fort.* 2. 1; 2. 4; 3. 2; *Cons. ad Polyb.* 10. 5; *Cons. ad Liviam* 369, 370; Ambrosius *op. cit.* i. 3; Lysias *Epitaphios* 24; *Cons. ad Apoll.* 10.

45. Life is not our home, but a place where we tarry for a brief space. 46. The time of death is uncertain, and death itself is in the hands of the gods. Those who are taken from us are taken for but a short time, and we shall soon be reunited. If any fear that death will be painful, it should be remembered that it usually is attended by little or no pain, sometimes even by pleasure. Whatever it is, it generally lasts but a moment, and when it lasts longer it is less painful, and shows that there is nothing to fear in death. 50. Sed turpe stultumque est homini, tanta tamque varia rerum cognitione instructo, non a se ipso potius mature, quam sero ab usu et cogitatione doloris remedia exspectare.

Cf. *Tusc.* iii. 22. 54: "sed id quod ratio debuerat, usus docet;" Plin. *Epistt.* xvi. 16. 10: "proinde si quas ad eum de dolore tam iusto litteras mittes, memento adhibere solacium, non quasi castigatorium et nimis forte, sed molle et humanum, quod ut facilius admittat multum faciet medii temporis spatium, ut enim crudum adhuc vulnus medentium manus reformidat, deinde patitur et ultro requirit, sic recens animi dolor consolationes reicit ac refugit, mox desiderat et clementer admotis adquiescit;" *Epistt.* viii. 5. 3; *Ad fam.* v. 16. 5; Ovid *Ex ponto* iv. 11. 13 ff.; Eur. *Alc.* 380, 381; *Cons. ad Apoll.* 20.

But philosophy fortifies us against all ills and guides us as we go through life. 54. That her father is still alive is the only thing that can trouble Tullia. She should think rather that he will follow soon. 55. Why should we try to avoid troubles, which nourish courage in us? Why shun death, which warns us to be better? 56. We should consider that death is a kindly servant of the gods.

Amid all the proclamations that death is a blessing, the rebellious outcry of Sappho strikes us with a refreshing sense of independence: ἦ ὥσπερ Σαπφώ, ὅτι τὸ ἀποθνήσκειν κακόν· οἱ θεοὶ κεκρίκασιν· ἀπέθνησκον γὰρ ἄν (*ap.* Ar. *Rhet.* ii. 23. 12).

The story of Amphiaraus proves that a speedy death is the gift of the gods. 62. What can happen to a man to make him desire to live? Learning? But learning breeds jealousy. The fine arts? The same is true of them. Politics? The fate of Miltiades, of Ephialtes, of Cimon, of Themistocles, of Aristides, of Metellus, of Scipio Africanus, of Regulus, of Marius, of Brutus, is a sufficient commentary on the political life. 67. The voluntary deaths of Cleomenes and Theagenes show the correct attitude of mind. Even a woman showed this same temper, Hasdrubal's wife: repetamus ex historiis Asdrubalis uxorem illam, quae, Carthagine in hostium potestatem redacta, se ipsam cum tribus filiis in conflagrantis patriae incendium immisit.

Cf. Val. Max. iii. 2, Ext. 6: "dextra laevaque communes filios mortem non recusantes trahens, incendio se flagrantis patriae obiecit."

68. Dicaearchus asserts that more people are killed by human cruelty than from any other cause.

For possible sources from which this statement might have come, and a general discussion of Dicaearchus' consolatory activity, cf. Buresch, p. 35.

69. Imagine all blessings conferred upon a man: all are perishable, and dependent upon time and chance. 70. Although nature has made man weak and frail, plurimos tamen insevit divinos ingeni iudicique igniculos, quorum auxilio et cum dolore luctari, et timori obsistere, labores vero omnes nullo negotio vincere ac perferre possemus. 71. If death comes to the old, it brings with it a condition better, or at least no worse. 72. Non enim is ego sum, qui animum simul cum homine interire putem, tantumque mentis lumen, e divina natura delibatum, posse exstingui, sed potius certo tempore emenso ad immortalitatem redire. 73. A man should be ashamed to grieve like a woman; those who do so are rightly reproached with the words

> Vos etenim iuvenes animum geritis muliebrem,
> illaque virgo viri.

The same verses are found in *De off.* i. 18. 61. The attribution of excessive grief to women is frequent, e. g., the passage just cited; *Ad fam.* v. 16. 6; Archilochus, frg. 9 B.

74. Gorgias was glad to die, and his temper is the one that a free man should have. 75. Do we grieve because our dear ones are dead? We should rather imitate those noble men who have borne with fortitude such afflictions. 77. Such a man was Anaxagoras.

Anaxagoras was a favorite example of the consoler. Cf. e. g., *Tusc.* iii. 24. 58; Val. Max. v. 10, Ext. 3, and for the sentiment cf. also *Tusc.* iii. 13. 28; Ambrosius *op. cit.* i. 1; Soph. *El.* 1171, 1172.

His words were worthy of a true philosopher. How can that man be free who is a slave to grief? 80. Another example was Xenophon, who performed the duties of a good man and a good citizen. 82. Still another was Pericles, who proved himself a good and wise man.

Cf. Hieron. *Epistt.* 60. 5 (M. I. 592): "Proponunt innumerabiles viros, et maxime Periclem et Xenophontem Socraticum" (the sentence is apparently written with the preceding list of consolers in mind); Val. Max. v. 10, Ext. 1 (Pericles) and 2 (Xenophon); *Cons. ad Apoll.* 33.

87. There is no misfortune so great that we ought to grieve—not death nor poverty nor exile, for each of these has, through the grace of the gods, the possibility of a greater blessing. Pleni sunt libri philosophorum, refertae argumentis ac rationibus paginae fere omnes, tanta autem exemplorum copia, ut nihil possit esse cumulatius. 91. Nam in tanta vel argumentorum vel exemplorum copia, quibus se legentes paene obrui sentient, ecquis se immobilem aut in dolore inexorabilem praebeat?

At this point the editions indicate a lacuna. There is certainly an interruption of the argument, but perhaps sufficient warning was given by the resumptive sentence just quoted. In the absence of MSS further speculation is useless.

92. There are some who will not be consoled by their friends, and who do not wish to be consoled. Let these have their way, but when time has solaced them a little, they will take pleasure in reading over the precepts of this *Consolatio*, and will be helped for the future by learning them by heart. For the casual reading of philosophy is not enough to fortify one against misfortune, as the author himself can testify from his own experience. 95. A few important topics remain. Perhaps we grieve because we are deprived of assistance by the death of friends. Grief of this sort is mercenary, and therefore base.

Cf. *Cons. ad Apoll.* 19.

96. Let us turn to Romans who have borne the deaths of sons in a way that may compare with even that of the Greeks mentioned above. 97. One of these was Fabius Maximus, who lost an only son. Neque solum non doluit, quod fortissimi fuit, sed etiam mortuo laudationem in foro dixit, quo nihil fortius aut laudabilius ne ex omni quidem antiquitate recenseri potest. Cuius orationem quis non admiretur, insignem ingeni, iudici, ordinis praestantia? Quo modo

ille vel ea quae dixit sine luctu dicere, aut quae scripsit sine dolore cogitare potuit? cum praesertim hoc in illa laudatione admirari et obstupescere soleamus, quod non, ut alii, de ceterorum fortitudine disputat, ut suum ipse dolorem aliorum exemplo minuat, sed in filio haerens illius maxime virtutes propriasque laudes quae vel acerbiorem efficere doloris sensum poterant, longissimo sermone persequitur.

Schulz, p. 37, believes that this *laudatio* was referred to in the *Consolatio* of Cicero, and there is no reason to dispute his conclusion. Nowhere else is there such a lengthy account of this famous *laudatio*, which was highly esteemed in antiquity. References to it are not infrequent, e.g., *Cato Mai.* 4. 12; *Ad fam.* iv. 6. 1; Plut. *Vit. Fab.* 24.

98. Another example is Horatius Pulvillus [cf. Val. Max. v. 10. 1]. 99. Another is L. Paulus [cf. Val. Max. v. 10. 2]. Others are Sulpicius Gallus, Q. Marcius Rex, P. Crassus, and Cn. Caepio. Iam quid Pisones, Scaevolas, Brutos, Marcellos, Metellos, Lepidos, Aufidios, enumerem?

Cf. Hieron. *Epistt.* 60. 5 (M. I. 592): "Pulvillus . . . . L. Paulus . . . . Praetermitto Maximos, Catones, Galos, Pisones, Brutos, Scaevolas, Metellos, Scauros, Marcios, Crassos, Marcellos atque Aufidios, quorum non minor in luctu quam in bellis virtus fuit, et quorum orbitates in *Consolationis* libro Tullius explicavit."

103. The author then passes to examples of women who have exhibited the same virtue. For on the stage of life, as Theophrastus calls it, all must play a part, and those who are cowardly will receive the censure of the gods as surely as a gladiator who desires to live at any cost is condemned by the people. 106. Spartan women are said to look whether their sons' wounds are in front, and if so, to receive the bodies, and the story is told that one regarded it as more glorious to die in battle than to win an Olympic victory. Another, hearing that her son had fallen in battle, said, Idcirco genueram, ut mortem pro patria fortiter occumbere non dubitaret.

Cf. *Tusc.* i. 42. 102: "Idcirco genueram, ut esset, qui pro patria mortem non dubitaret occumbere."

106. Roman matrons have been as noble, Cornelia, Rutilia, Clodia.

Rutilia and Clodia are the subjects of questions to Atticus (*Ad Att.* xii. 20. 2; xii. 22. 2), probably for use in the *Consolatio*, though some have doubted this. Cornelia appears again in Seneca *Cons. ad Marc.* 16. 1 ff., Rutilia in Seneca *Cons. ad Helv.* 16. 7.

111. To the list of brave men may be added Theramenes.

See *Tusc.* i. 40. 96; *Cons. ad Apoll.* 6; cf. Val. Max. iii. 2, Ext. .

115. All hope for themselves the fortune of Priam or Metellus, forgetting that their good fortune did not attend them to the end. No one can expect anything better.

The passage has a very marked resemblance to *Tusc.* i. 35. 85, as will be pointed out in detail below (p. 29).

118. L. Crassus was saved from misfortune by an opportune death.

The passage will be compared later (p. 30) with the famous passage in *De oratore* iii. 2. 8, which may be compared with Seneca *Cons. ad Marc.* 20. 5; Tac. *Agr.* 45 1; Ambrosius *op. cit.* i. 30; and with an entirely independent passage from the Bible, *Raptus est, ne malitia mutaret cor eius.* That these are not safely to be regarded as imitations of the earliest example given, that from Cicero, was pointed out by Morowski *De rhetoribus lat.*, p. 15 (cited by Hendrickson *The Proconsulate of Julius Agricola*, p. 33), who showed that the figure is conventional in first-century rhetoric.

120. Tenemus enim memoria, aut saltem ex patrum scriptis accepimus, crudelissimam omnium caedem illo tempore esse factam, trucidatos bonos viros et cives, incisas eorum cervices in rostrisque positas, qui multorum civium salutem ac dignitatem eloquentia peperissent. 123. The one-time prosperity and final fall of Pompey are next discussed.

This, like the preceding, is reserved for fuller commentary (p. 40).

Noble Romans, at the price of a moment's pain, won for themselves eternal fame, dying for their fatherland. 127. He then reverts to the nature of death. What death is, can be inferred from sleep and from the condition before birth. 132. Mortem igitur, siquidem somno similis est, singulis noctibus induimur, et, cum in somno sensus sit plane nullus, nullum etiam in morte futurum esse sensum, verissime statuere debemus. . . . . Mors enim quemadmodum ad eum, qui nondum ortus est, nihil pertinuit, sic ne ad eum quidem, qui mortuus est, ulla ratione pertinebit. Ad morientem vero vel nihil, vel parum certe pertinet.

The relation of death to sleep in literature has been commented on above (p. 14); for the second of these ideas cf. *Tusc.* i. 38. 91: "Natura vero si se sic habet, ut quo modo initium nobis rerum omnium ortus noster adferat, sic exitum mors, ut nihil pertinuit ad nos ante ortum, sic nihil post mortem pertinebit." Cf. *Cons. ad Apoll.* 15; Anaxagoras *ap.* Stob. *Flor.* 120. 19 G.

133. But some say that the dying are tortured by pain. That is true in some cases, but usually only of those whose lives have not been above reproach, so that it is more likely the work of conscience. Then too, those who have never thought of death are disturbed when it does come. But good men die gladly, and with little or no pain. 137. Such were Q. Fabius, A. Pompeius, and Thalna. 139. Some say that the same day of death is established for all; that is not true. It is true, however, that bounds of life are fixed for us by the gods, which we may not pass. In the former case, why should man practice virtue? If the end is fixed, it cannot be moved by virtue; if it lies within the power of each to decide, it is not fixed. Sed de his statuat unus quisque ut libet. Quid autem verius sit, deus ipse viderit; hominem quidem scire arbitror neminem. 141. We often wish for

death as a means of escape from trouble. 142. It is especially in the case of the virtuous that there is great good in death. 144. They return to the place whence they came, and then truly live. 145. Recte igitur dictum est, corpus terram esse, mentem autem ignem de caelo sumptum. This is proved by the virtuous lives of good men.

Cf. *Tusc.* i. 25. 60: "Animae sit animus ignisne, nescio, nec me pudet, ut istos, fateri nescire quod nesciam;" and *Somn. Scip.* 3. 7: "iis (*sc.* hominibus) animus datus est ex illis sempiternis ignibus."

The body is earth, and returns to earth, but the soul is from heaven, and returns to heaven.

Cf. Aesch. *Choeph.* 127, 128.

146. The same ends of life and rewards of death are not to be assigned to the good and bad. This thought is especially pleasant because Tullia was good and brave. 148. She is undoubtedly in a happier state now than she was in life.

Here begins almost the only characterization of Tullia we are given. Its method is direct and informal.

She had no evil thoughts, endured patiently, and thanked heaven for all. Justice, and not herself, was her care, and honor to the gods. Her natural impulses were toward the right. Her skill in housewifery is praised, and her learning, almost equal to a man's. Bravely, she sought help from herself, even for mental worries. She was distressed at her father's exile, but always hoped for his recall. Ita, quantum ex calamitate doloris, tantundem ex filiae suavitate ac pietate solati capiebamus. 152. What is pleasanter than to think that she is immortal? Animos enim esse immortales, ne dubitandum mihi quidem videtur.

He then proceeds to review the arguments for immortality.

The *quaedam vis veneratione digna* in the bodies of the dead does not impress the author as a strong argument. If authority is asked, what better can be procured than that of the man whom Apollo pronounced wisest? The arguments which the *Italici* devised are hard to refute. The speed of the soul, traversing in a moment the labors of years, indicates its divine origin. So do the power of memory, and the gift of predicting the future. Another reason is the fact that it possesses *principium et perpetuitas motus*. The soul is the image of god, and comes from heaven: why then, should it not be immortal? No origin for the soul can be found in the earth, for it is unlike any of earth's elements. God can be apprehended by the mind alone, and our progress can be explained only by supposing divine inspiration. The thirst for wealth and power differentiates man from the other living creatures. If wise men thought that the soul died with the body, how could they die so gladly, while fools die so unwillingly? The worship of the dead has cause only in the belief that the soul lives on. The strongest proof is that man alone has knowledge of the divine and can appreciate it, the power which rules all things.

This, in brief, is the argument of our *Consolatio* regarding the immortality of the soul. It would be interesting, if space permitted, to compare it in detail with such a line of reasoning as that, for example, of Ambrosius in the second book of the *De excessu fratris*. There would of course be striking differences. Let us examine in a more detailed way some of the arguments. *Celeritas animi* was one of the favorite arguments. Cicero uses it in *Tusc.* i. 19. 43 ff., and in *De div.* ii. 67. 139. The *quaedam vis* is expounded at greater length in *Tusc.* i. 12. 27. For memory as a proof of immortality, cf. *Tusc.* i. 24. 57; for *principium et perpetuitas motus*, cf. *Tusc.* i. 23. 53 ff., for the former only, *De div. loc. cit.*, for the latter only, *Somn. Scip.* 8. 19. Other proofs of immortality are elsewhere used by Cicero, to whom I have confined the references intentionally. Cicero's belief or doubt regarding the question has been freely discussed, but without entire unanimity of opinion. For literary purposes his belief is clear, his confidence admirable. Such is his feeling in the *Tusculan Disputations*, the *De republica*, and the *Cato Maior*. Very different is the usual temper in the letters. See, e. g., *Ad fam.* vi. 4. 4: "deinde quod mihi ad consolationem commune tecum est, si iam vocer ad exitum vitae, non ab ea republica avellar, qua carendum esse doleam, praesertim cum id sine ullo sensu futurum sit;" *Ad fam.* vi. 21. 1: "una ratio videtur, quicquid evenerit, ferre moderate, praesertim cum omnium rerum mors sit extremum;" *Ad Att.* xii. 18. 1: "longumque illud tempus, cum non ero, magis me movet quam hoc exiguum, quod mihi tamen nimis longum videtur." *Ad Att.* x. 8. 8 seems rather to refer to fame than to immortality: "tempus est nos de illa perpetua iam, non de hac exigua vita, cogitare." Friedländer (*Sittengesch.* III^{6}. 746) takes Cicero as a type of the learned eclectic, but apparently regards the *Tusculans* as representative of his real views, as in fact they may have been at the particular time. Boissier (*La religion romaine*^{4} 59) says: "Ces nobles espérances d'immortalité dont il a rempli ses ouvrages ne lui reviennent jamais à la pensée dans ses malheurs ou dans ses périls." Cf. Rohde's words (*Psyche* 616. 2): "Die Vorliebe für solche Unsterblichkeitshoffnungen blieb bei Cicero (und wohl durchweg bei den Gebildeten seiner Zeit und seiner Gesellschaft) nur eine künstlerische. Wo er nicht rhetorisirt oder als Schriftsteller sich in Pose setzt, in seinen Briefen namentlich, zeigt er keine Spur von Ueberzeugungen der sonst mit Pathos vertretenen Richtung." A volume would be required even to sum up all that has been written on the general subject, and it is not our purpose to add to the literature. Some acquaintance with Cicero's attitude, at least, toward the question is necessary to enable us to form an opinion, when the proper time comes, as to the genuineness of our *Consolatio*. The passage,

"animorum nulla in terra origo . . . . motu sempiterno," is quoted in *Tusc.* i. 27. 66 from the *Consolatio.* The words, "animorum nulla . . . . nisi a deo," are found also in Lact. *De ira* 10. 45; the words "nec vero . . . . movens" in Lact. *Inst.* i. 5. 25.

165. Nature is not always productive, so why should we expect success always? The end is death, which is common to all men, frees us from error, and leads us to a knowledge of the truth, which all men desire.

Cf. *Tusc.* i. 19. 44: "propterea quod et natura inest in mentibus nostris insatiabilis quaedam cupiditas veri videndi."

168. If grief is to be censured, so is he who grieves, but as Crantor says, a moderate degree of grief is proper.

Cf. *Tusc.* i. 6. 12, where his censure of *indolentia* is quoted.

Both extremes are to be avoided. Pity and sympathy are natural to men, for we are all much alike. 175. When we realize that we must endure whatever comes to us, we shall be nearer the truth, and be better men. Grief is not a thing from which both good and evil may be derived, but only evil. We must, then, bravely resist it. 178. How will our mourning help the dead? All they ask of us is honor and recollection, as the epitaph of Ennius declares. 183. The neglect of virtue and piety brings trouble upon us. 184. The good, on the other hand, are frequently exalted into heaven, not in body, but in spirit. 185. Quod de Romulo, urbis nostrae conditore, memoriae proditum accepimus; quem singulare in genus hominum collatum munus tam praeclarae urbis condendae in deorum numero collocavit, idque eo tempore quo, litteris et doctrinis homines exculti facile fictum a germano, verum a falso secernebant, ut credi non possit, quicquam illis persuaderi potuisse, quod ullam ficti aut falsi imaginem prae se ferret. Hercules, Liber, Castor and Pollux, and many women have been similarly deemed worthy of divine honors.

Cf. *Tusc.* i. 12. 28, where a list is given including Romulus, Hercules, Liber, the Tyndaridae, and Ino (=many women?).

That they have been received into heaven is proved by the universal agreement of wise men, and by the fact that there is no other place worthy of them. They revealed god-like traits of character, and so should be near the gods. Quis enim Hercule fortior? quis prudentior? quis ab omni cupiditate remotior? Others were equally deserving. Their rewards are not statues or crowns, but the more enduring rewards of those who chose a life of virtue. It is right that they be separated from this wicked world. 191. Our wisest men have seen that the good and bad should be dealt with differently after death. Let us choose rather to be with the good.

Sec. 192 is quoted from the *Consolatio* by Lactantius *Inst.* iii. 19. 3. For a similar sentiment, cf. the opinion of Socrates, reported in *Tusc.* i. 30. 72:

"Ita enim censebat, itaque disseruit, duas esse vias, duplicesque cursus animorum e corpore excedentium," etc.

194. Those who are striving for glory count as light all the labor it costs. This is especially true in public life. The Spartans and Athenians, honoring as gods their fellow-citizens who have fallen fighting for their country, have shown true wisdom. No better reward can be desired than to be exalted to heaven, there to associate with the great and good men who have gone before. Let us not forget the dignity that comes from temples and public worship. 203. The cause of the deification of mortals has been virtue, which looks toward the public welfare. Men will imitate what has before gained the ends they desire. When we have virtues, why worship beasts or fish, as the Egyptians and the Syrians do? The Egyptians at least, with all their wisdom, should see the folly of such a course, yet they worship the foulest creatures. 209. Certain natural phenomena were deified by the early Romans, and being established by reason and custom, cannot safely be disturbed. 210. The Greeks in this respect are not so worthy of praise as usual, with their deifications of Cupidines and Amores. Deification should be reserved to be the reward of virtue and of service to humanity. 212. [quoted from the *Consolatio* by Lactantius *Inst.* i. 15. 16 ff.]. Let us recognize the wisdom of those who have deified the virtuous, but not restrict the honor to those who are now in possession of it. 213. This plea is made, not on behalf of Tullia alone, but of all who show themselves worthy. Tullia will live on as long as those *monumenta* which are a tribute of praise to her. When she shall have *supremum honorem*, and then alone, will her father have done this full duty to her. When the place which he has chosen shall have the nature of a temple, this will be accomplished. 216. [quoted with sec. 212 by Lactantius *loc. cit.*]. Tullia is as worthy of deification as any of those who have received the honor. Tu ergo in eo ipso fano, quod ad nominis tui memoriam ac cultum votum dedicatumque est, et laudari te et coli senties. You know, Tullia, how bravely I have always resisted fortune, and how bravely I fought my enemies. But when the last blow fell, in your death, I have nothing to say but "Cedo, et manus tollo." 218. Strengthened by consolation, and by the certainty that you are in heaven, I seem almost to triumph over my grief. Do not forget me, but lead me where you are, and our meeting will be the pleasanter that our separation has been bitter.

The deification of Tullia, and the erection of a shrine in her honor was one of the projects nearest to Cicero's heart in the months following her death. The twelfth book of the letters to Atticus is full of it. The location and method of choosing the site are considered in frequent letters. One of the early letters is *Ad Att.* xii. 18: "Ego, quantum his temporibus tam eruditis fieri potuerit, profecto illam consecrabo omni genere monumentorum ab omnium ingeniis sumptorum et Graecorum et Latinorum; quae res forsitan sit refricatura vulnus meum. Sed iam quasi voto quodam et promisso me teneri puto," etc. Attacks on fortune seem to have been a

regular feature of the consolation: cf. Lact. *Inst.* iii. 28. 8, 9: "Iam quicumque aliquos consolati sunt ob interitum amissionemque carorum, fortunae nomen acerrimis accusationibus prosciderunt." This is confirmed by such passages as Seneca *Cons. ad Polyb.* 16. 4: "Haec ergo puta tibi parentem publicum referre exempla, eundem ostendere, quam nihil sacrum intactumque sit Fortunae;" and Stat. *Silv.* ii. 6. 8: "quia rerum nomina caeca Sic miscet Fortuna manu." Cf. also Fichon *Lactance*, p. 257. In the same passage Lactantius refers to the *Consolatio* of Cicero in this way: "M. Tullius in sua *Consolatione* pugnasse se semper contra fortunam loquitur, eamque a se semper esse superatam, cum fortiter inimicorum impetus rettudisset; ne tum quidem se ab ea fractum, cum domo pulsus patria caruerit; tum autem, cum amiserit carissimam filiam, victum se esse a fortuna turpiter confitetur. Cedo, inquit, et manum tollo." Petrarch (*Lettere senile* viii. 1) quotes this last phrase also. As Petrarch was acquainted with Lactantius, this phrase might have come from there, and not from the *Consolatio* directly. It can be shown that Petrarch did not know the *Consolatio* of Cicero, and therefore did not borrow the words directly from Cicero. It has been believed by some that one of the topics which Cicero must have used in his *Consolatio* was the condition of the state, that he who died in such times as these left behind a situation that was almost intolerable. Such an argument is used in some of the consolatory letters of Cicero, e. g., *Ad fam.* v. 13, 16, 17, 18; and by Sulpicius in his letter to Cicero (*Ad fam.* iv. 5. 3). The situation in the *Consolatio*, however, was somewhat different. Cicero would hardly have allowed himself the same freedom of speech in a more or less formal literary production like his *Consolatio* as in a letter, even of the semi-public character of a consolation. It seems unsafe, then, to assume that Cicero did make use of such an argument, and to condemn this *Consolatio* simply because it is here omitted.

The parallels quoted have been mainly from Cicero, for various reasons: if this is the genuine *Consolatio*, we should like to know its relation to other works; if it is not, it is desirable to know how small or how large a range of literature the imitator would have to command, i. e., to know from what sources he could have derived most of his material. Then, too, the nature of the subject makes it inevitable that a large part of the illustrative quotations should come from Cicero. The relation to other works of Cicero and of other authors will need to be borne in mind when we come to consider the question of the authenticity of our *Consolatio*.

CHAPTER IV

THE AUTHENTICITY OF OUR CONSOLATIO

We have examined the method of construction of our *Consolatio*, without being primarily interested in the origin of the document. The principal question for us is now to be considered, whether or no the work is genuine. Any student of authenticity may have a twofold problem before him, the parts of which may or may not be of equal difficulty and interest. His first desire is to ascertain whether or no the work is genuine, and if it prove to be so, his work is done. If, however, it prove to be a forgery, the second task remains, of attempting to attribute it to a period, or perhaps even to an individual. It may in addition be desirable to find motives for the forgery. Our first concern is then to decide for ourselves the question of the genuineness of our *Consolatio*. The decision may rest on different sorts of evidence, of perhaps varying value. No certain criteria can be established in advance which will be of universal application, except within very wide limits. There is, then, opportunity for the use of any test that will promise to aid in the solution: relation to other documents, of Cicero and others, language, style, use of *clausulae*, etc. The relation to other documents would in this case involve the whole question of imitation, of the use of quotations, of the use of the consolatory commonplaces, of the applicability to this *Consolatio*, of references to it in literature, and of the use in our *Consolatio* of the known fragments. The evidence of language and style may be based on syntax, vocabulary, phraseology, etc., though this form of evidence may not be of much value. The *clausulae* may be compared with those of other works of Cicero, and this test may have a certain degree of value. If the document prove to be spurious, this same test may perhaps be applied to the theories of authorship that have been proposed. Finally, other sorts of evidence in great variety may be found, the presence or absence of possible Christian points of view, the author's method of citation, etc. In a word, anything which may have a bearing on the question is worth examining.

Let us first review the fragments of Cicero's *Consolatio* as they are presented by the editors. From Sigonius down to the most recent editors, the collection of fragments has suffered few changes of any consequence. An occasional change of reading has been introduced, but otherwise the list remains much the same as it was when it was first put together by Sigonius. The order of the fragments has not remained the same. In our *Con-*

solatio they are found in the same order in which Sigonius in his edition of Cicero arranged them, a fact which aroused the curiosity and suspicion of Riccoboni. The answer was the obvious one: All that such a state of affairs proves is that the order which Sigonius adopted is the correct one—an answer of unimpeachable logic, if the premises be accepted. Between the time of Sigonius' edition and the publication of this *Consolatio*, another edition of the fragments had appeared, by Patricius. This collection introduces some slight changes, of possible importance to us. The choice of fragments involves a considerable degree of difficulty and uncertainty; not all editors would classify all fragments in the same way. Müller in the Teubner edition, for example, includes among the fragments the following, from Lact. *Ad Stat. Theb.* i. 306: "Hoc iter vitae tam confragosum putamus, tam plenum iniuriarum ac miseriarum atque laborum." Certainly its sentiment might well give it a place in the *Consolatio*, yet Jahnke, *ad loc.*, regards it as "incertae sedis." Müller includes among the "Fragmenta Librorum Incertorum" the following: "Quoniam utraque earum sententiarum [concerning immortality and death] doctissimos habuit auctores nec, quid certi sit, divinari potest" (Lact. *Inst.* vii. 8. 9), which Schulz, p. 42, n. 2, regards with some probability as a fragment of the *Consolatio*. Neither of these possible fragments is to be found in our *Consolatio*. Despite the practical agreement of the editors, the only fragments we are sure of are those quoted by Cicero himself, for those given by Lactantius may be derived from this *Consolatio*. All the generally accepted fragments do appear here, and in a perfectly natural manner in most cases. What we should most like to know is not, what fragments are received by modern editors, but what were so received by Sigonius in the sixteenth century, and Barzizza in the fifteenth. Of the former, we can be sure; of the latter, we are unfortunately in complete ignorance. Let us consider the fragments in the order in which they appear in our *Consolatio*.

7. "Crantorem sequor." The fragment was sufficiently commented on above, p. 2.

7. "Sed humanae naturae incommoda ita diligenter et accurate expressit, ut quasi luendorum scelerum causa nasci homines et in hanc lucem ingredi, possis agnoscere." Cf. Lact. *Inst.* iii. 18. 18, quoted above, p. 12. I have already indicated that one theory of the date of our *Consolatio* is that though spurious it is ancient, and perhaps precedes the time of Lactantius. Ellis *Cl. Rev.* VII. 197 thinks that this is so, that this *Consolatio* was substituted for the original, and was used as the genuine by Lactantius. The agreement here and elsewhere may be equally well explained on the theory of genuineness, or on that of a later imitation. In the latter case,

the explanation would be that the forger knew the passage in Lactantius and arranged his work to fit.

36. "Ex quo intelligi licet . . . . proxime accedere." The words are quoted in Lactantius *Inst.* iii. 19. 13, from the *Consolatio.* Sigonius, following some of the Lactantius MSS, read at the end "effugere violentiam fortunae;" Patricius, with whom our *Consolatio* agrees, omits "violentiam." It may be noted that the language of Lactantius is not quite appropriate to our *Consolatio.* He attributes the words to Silenus directly, whereas in our *Consolatio* they are put into the general statement which introduces the story, and later only a paraphrase is put into the mouth of Silenus: "Docuit autem regem, numquam nasci optimum esse, sed celeritatem mortis proxime accedere." That Lactantius has the usual form of the story in mind is vouched for by the manner of its occurrence in *Tusc.* i. 48. 114, and in *Cons. ad Apoll.* 27. In the *Tusculans* the words, "et . . . . fortunae," are omitted: the *Tusculans* cannot then be regarded as Lactantius' immediate source. It would be of interest to know whether the following words of Lactantius will apply to our *Consolatio*: "Credidisse illum vanissimo dicto exinde apparet, quod adiecit aliquid de suo, ut ornaret." One more question remains to be asked: our *Consolatio* apologizes for this story with the words, "si gravioribus ludicra interdum admiscere liceat." What is the relation of these words to the use of "ineptias" in *Tusc.* i. 40. 95: "contemnamus igitur omnes ineptias (quod enim levius huic levitati nomen imponam?)," a passage which refers to Aristotle's story of creatures in the region of the Pontus that live but a day? Note also the use of *ματαίους* in a similar connection in *Cons. ad Apoll.* 18.

55. "Sed qui nos teneat error, aut miserabilis ignoratio veri." Cf. Lact. *Inst.* iii. 14. 20.

156. "Animorum nulla . . . . motu sempiterno." The sources used by the editors were enumerated above, p. 22. Some small differences exist, but their importance is minimized by the fact that there are no known MSS.

192. "Nec enim omnibus . . . . pervolare." Cf. Lact. *Inst.* iii. 19. 3. Our *Consolatio* again agrees with Patricius against Sigonius in reading "castos autem animos," Sigonius omitting the last word. The Lactantius MSS seem to be divided. Lambinus reads "castos autem (al' castos animos et puros) puros" etc. Sigonius alone reads "inde cursum," where others have "eundem cursum."

212 and 216. "Cum vero . . . . constitutamque habemus." Cf. Lact. *Inst.* i. 15, 16 ff., where the division in our *Consolatio* does not exist, or has not been preserved by the MSS. Again our *Consolatio* goes against

Sigonius and with Patricius, in reading "assentiamur" where Sigonius has "assentiam." Just above our *Consolatio* has "eorum in urbibus;" Sigonius, "in eorum urbibus;" Patricius, "eorum in urbibus, al' in eorum urbibus," indicating that the differences here, and so probably also elsewhere, are due to the fact that he and Sigonius used different MSS of Lactantius.

217. "Cedo, et manum tollo." Cf. Lact. *Inst.* iii. 28. 9. Sigonius and Patricius read "en manum;" Petrarch (if we may trust the quotation in Bünemann's *Lactantius, ad loc.*, the *Lettere senile* being accessible only in the Italian translation edited by Fracasetti) read "et manus."

We are now ready to consider resemblances of form. I stated above (p. 6) my belief that resemblance in form does not necessarily imply a relationship, still less the direction of the indebtedness, in case one is shown in other ways to exist. It is hardly worth our while to examine in detail all the passages which exhibit a resemblance in form of expression to admittedly genuine works of Cicero. It would take too long to look at each of these passages separately and in the light of all the rest, but perhaps the inspection of certain striking passages will prove of assistance in determining whether or no our *Consolatio* is genuine. Practically all the most interesting of these were pointed out long ago by Riccoboni, though some rather important aspects were overlooked by him. The interpretation of such connections is obviously a very delicate matter, and too much confidence should not be placed in any individual's judgment. Lessing's dictum, that an imitator is prone to pass from the great to the monstrous, from the marvelous to the impossible (*Laocoon*, p. 38, n. 2 Blümner), has here little validity. We must, then, proceed with great caution, and I should say in advance that I personally do not have the highest confidence in deductions made from such evidence alone. While the attitude of a modern investigator would be entirely different from that of a Riccoboni or a Sigonius, there is no better illustration of the possibility of interpreting evidence in opposite ways. It is almost laughable to note how confidently Riccoboni will point out passages in which our *Consolatio* and the *Tusculans*, for example, are similar, and assert that forgery is thereby proved, while Sigonius will draw the opposite inference, and charge that Cicero in the *Tusculans* was the imitator. When even sixteenth-century scholars can differ so radically, we should use more care than has sometimes been employed. The difficulty of our task is increased by the skill with which the forger, if it be a forger, has done his work.

Riccoboni calls attention to the similarity in the use of those stock examples, Cleobis and Bito, Trophonius and Agamedes, *Cons.* 28; *Tusc.* i. 57.

113 ff. A resemblance in form would be almost inevitable: the stories, as we saw above (p. 13), were part of the rhetorical common property, and it would seem unduly subtle to say that one use of them is an imitation of another. The same use is made of the Silenus story, for which see above, p. 14. This story is followed in both our *Consolatio* and the *Tusculans* by a reference to Euripides, in the latter case, with a quotation from the *Cresphontes*, in the former, without it, "ut," says Riccoboni, "imitatio magis occultaretur."

Riccoboni points out the similarity in the list of *exempla* in the two works. Note especially *Tusc.* i. 37. 89, where Lucius Brutus, the three Decii, the Scipios, Paulus, Geminus, Marcellus, Albinus, and Gracchus are mentioned, and *Cons.* 126 (Lucius Brutus, the two Decii, Scipio, Paulus, Marcellus, Albinus). The treatment of *exempla* in general is worth a brief consideration. Not only is there a resemblance in the names, which would be natural, but other similarities that are more striking may be observed. An example is the following (*Cons.* 115): "et Priamum non omni orbatum progenie summoque dolore confectum hostilis manus interemerit. . . . . (116) Miserabiliter decantata Haec omnia . . . . turpari. . . . . Num ei multo melius evenisset, si vitam omnino multis ante annis quam haec acciderent amisisset?" Cf. *Tusc.* i. 35. 85: "Priamum tanta progenie orbatum, cum in aram confugisset, hostilis manus interemit. . . . . At certe melius evenisset nec tam flebiliter illa canerentur Haec omnia . . . . turpari." Equally interesting is the use of the fate of Pompey, which follows in both. *Cons.* 123: "Pompeii autem, nostri familiaris, casu quid in civitate notius, quid illustrius, quid omnium oculis ac mentibus perspectius et clarius? Hunc, si mature extinctus esset, nihil doloris, nihil invasisset mali. . . . . (124) Sed videamus quantum in rebus humanis fortunae possit iniuria. Nisi malimus ad propriam mortalis vitae nimis asperam miseramque condicionem omnia mala revocare. Qui enim amplissimis fortunis usus erat, qui nihil nisi sublime ac beatum nec cogitare nec optare consueverat, cui omnia vel ad usum vel ad voluptatem supererant, bellum cum socero suscepit, deseruit domum, profugit ex Italia, et cum antea nihil in ceteris bellis nisi summo consilio prudentiaque gessisset, cum vel maxime ingenio iudicioque excellere debuisset, sui paene oblitus est. (125) Itaque imbelles et infirmas copias, tirones collecticiosque milites cum robustissimis legionibus conferre non dubitavit, et amisso exercitu ereptisque castris turpissime victus in servorum manus vir summus et clarissimus incidit. . . . . Beatissimus autem obiisset, si, cum in re publica florebat, cum valebat auctoritate et gratia, cum copiis opibusque affluebat, e vita decessisset. Cuius propagatio quantum maeroris et luctus attulerit, non modo scribendo, sed

vix etiam cogitando, consequi quisquam possit." The passage in the *Tusculans* is less carefully worked out, and lacks especially the elaborate syncrisis which is so marked a feature of the other. *Tusc.* i. 35. 86: "Pompeio nostro familiari, cum graviter aegrotaret Neapoli, melius est factum. . . . . Utrum igitur, si tum esset extinctus, a bonis rebus an a malis, discessisset? Certe a miseris. Non enim cum socero bellum gessisset, non imparatus arma sumpsisset, non domum reliquisset, non ex Italia fugisset, non, exercitu amisso, nudus in servorum ferrum et manus incidisset [non liberi defleti, non fortunae omnes a victoribus possiderentur]. Qui si mortem tum obiisset, in amplissimis fortunis occidisset, is propagatione vitae quot, quantas, quam incredibiles hausit calamitates!" The close connection between the two passages is obvious, despite the greater pains bestowed upon the *Consolatio*. The inference that some relation exists between them can hardly be avoided. Such a similarity can hardly have been a mere accident. Cicero probably nowhere expresses so freely an uncomplimentary opinion of Pompey's conduct in the final scenes of his life as here, but cf. *Ad fam.* vii. 3. 2: "vir ille summus nullus imperator fuit." Yet we must guard against a premature conclusion.

Attention was called by Riccoboni to the discrepancy between our *Consolatio* and the *Tusculans* in the account of the Decii. In the latter that form of the story is adopted which causes three members of the family to give their lives for their country, in the former apparently only two are mentioned. The accounts of these personages are so contradictory that it is almost impossible to convict anyone of a historical blunder. Elsewhere Cicero mentions only two, e. g., *De off.* iii. 4. 16, and *Cato Mai.* 20. 75.

So much for the parallelism between our *Consolatio* and the *Tusculans* in the matter of *exempla*. Some resemblances to other works may now be noted. An interesting case is the Crassus passage (*Cons.* 118 ff.): "Nam, qua in patriam pietate fuit, ex iis malis quae mortem eius consecuta sunt, incredibilem, si vixisset, dolorem accepisset. (119) Flagravit enim bello Italia, exarsit senatus invidia, nihil denique in civitate fuit quod non eius temporis calamitatem luctumque persenserit. Nam quid fugam Marii, quid cetera quae in illius discessu acciderunt, maxime luctuosa summeque miseranda commemorem? quid reditum illum sanguinarium, cuius ex recordatione nemo est qui non intimis sensibus exhorrescat." The account of the death of Crassus in *De oratore* iii. 2. 8 immediately comes to mind: "Non vidit flagrantem bello Italiam, non ardentem invidia senatum, non sceleris nefarii principes civitatis reos, non luctum filiae, non exilium generi, non acerbissimam C. Marii fugam, non illam post reditum eius caedem omnium crudelissimam, non denique in omni genere deformatam eam

civitatem, in qua ipse florentissima multum omnibus [gloria] praestitisset." Sigonius' comment on the passage is worth quoting: "Hoc mihi vere videor esse dicturus, Ciceronem nullo in loco uberius flumen eloquentiae profudisse quam in prooemiis librorum *De oratore*, et tamen, cum ibi et hic argumentum idem tractavit, hic videri omnia maiore ornatur, ac copia explicuisse, ac nescio quo modo insigniorem verborum florem ac lumen orationis adhibuisse."

Let us examine a few more of the many similar passages. A close verbal parallel may be seen in *Cons.* 58: "Itaque Cato sic e vita discessit, ut laetaretur, causam se nactum esse moriendi," and *Tusc.* i. 30. 74: "Cato autem sic abiit e vita, ut causam moriendi nactum se esse gauderet." Another is *Cons.* 72: "tantumque mentis lumen, e divina natura delibatum, posse exstingui," and *Cato Mai.* 11. 36: "nam haec quoque (*sc.* vires animi) nisi tamquam lumini oleum instilles, exstinguuntur senectute," and *Cato Mai.* 21. 78: "*plus* numquam dubitasse quin ex universa mente divina delibatos animos haberemus." The mixture of figures may be explained on the theory of contamination. Another possible imitation may be seen in "si eorum (*sc.* deorum) voluntati repugnet, cum dis gigantum more bellare videbitur" (*Cons.* 6), and "quid est aliud gigantum more bellare cum dis nisi naturae repugnare?" (*Cato Mai.* 2. 6). The anecdote of Panaetius, told in *Cons.* 129, is also to be found, though in rather different language, in *De off.* i. 26. 90. Cf. the very close parallelism between *Cons.* 70 and *De repub.* iii. 1 (=August. *Contra Iul. Pelag.* 4. 12), and between *Cons.* 184 and *De repub.* iii. 28. 40 (=August. *De civit. Dei* xxii. 4). Another example is *Cons.* 41 and *Ad Att.* xii. 21. 5. In numerous passages similar ideas are expressed in different language: an example was quoted above (p. 18), *Cons.* 106 and *Tusc.* i. 19. 44.

To these may be added some resemblances to passages in other authors, notably Valerius Maximus. I shall quote at length a single example, *Cons.* 98: "Quod singularis virtutis exemplum [the reference is to the conduct of Fabius after the death of his son] fortasse Horatii Pulvilli laudem magna ex parte diminuere videatur; quem tamen summum virum silentio praeterire nefas ducimus, cum in eo ipso, quod filii mortem aequissimo ac fortissimo animo tulit, etiam Iovi optimo maximo, cuius aedem dedicabat, gratissimum fecisse videatur. Nam pontifex inter sollemnium verborum nuncupationem postem tenens, ut filium mortuum audivit, neque manum a poste removit, ne sacra dirimeret, nec vultum a populo avertit, ne suum potius dolorem quam populi utilitatem ac salutem cogitare videretur." Then follows the story of Aemilius Paulus. Cf. Val. Max. v. 10. 1: "Horatius Pulvillus cum in Capitolio Iovi optimo maximo aedem pontifex dedicaret

interque nuncupationem sollemnium verborum postem tenens mortuum esse filium audisset, neque manum a poste removit, ne tanti templi dedicationem interrumperet, nec vultum a publica religione ad privatum dolorem deflexit, ne patris magis quam pontificis partes egisse videretur. Clarum exemplum, nec minus tamen illustre quod sequitur." The following here too is the story of Aemilius Paulus. In addition to the general similarity of language, one may note that *nuncupatio* is nowhere reported by the lexica to Cicero, though I should not attach too great importance to such a fact. The resemblance between the opening words in the *Consolatio* and the closing formula of the other is curious and perhaps not without significance. Valerius, from the nature of the case, needed no introduction, while the author of our *Consolatio* did. The last sentence in Valerius serves as a perfect transition to the following section, and the similar sentence in our *Consolatio* is equally good as a connecting link between Fabius and Pulvillus. For other examples of close verbal parallelism, cf. *Cons.* 99 with Val. Max. v. 10. 2; *Cons.* 80 with Val. Max. v. 10, Ext. 2; *Cons.* 82 with Val. Max. v. 10, Ext. 1. That this *Consolatio* was not Valerius' only source is proved by the greater detail given by him in such passages as that dealing with Aemilius, as that relating the courage of Theramenes, and by the slight difference in the accounts of Hasdrubal's wife. This being the case, it is not a necessary assumption that it is a source at all, a possibility that must be borne in mind when we come to study the date of the author. One more point in connection with Valerius. References to the consul Thalna are infrequent in Roman literature. In *Cons.* 137 we read: "itemque Thalnae consuli, dis immortalibus sacrificanti." The same incident is related by Valerius ix. 12. 3, though without any obvious verbal relation.

The whole matter of the use of *exempla* deserves a word of comment. We have seen a suspicious resemblance in our *Consolatio* to the *Tusculans* and to Valerius Maximus. Let us now consider the relation between our *Consolatio* and the list of Romans mentioned by Hieronymus as included by Cicero in his *Consolatio*. This list was quoted above, p. 18, in connection with sec. 101. With the exception of the Scauri, all these names are met with in our *Consolatio*. On the basis of so small a difference one would hardly be justified in drawing conclusions. We may, however, raise the question whether *explicavit* is the proper word to apply to such a summary enumeration as that in sec. 101.

In a number of letters to Atticus, Cicero asks for information on certain points; cf. *Ad Att.* xii. 20. 2: "Velim me facias certiorem proximis litteris, Cn. Caepio, Serviliae Claudi pater, vivone patre suo naufragio perierit, an mortuo, item Rutilia vivone C. Cotta, filio suo, mortua sit, an mortuo.

Pertinent ad eum librum, quem de luctu minuendo scripsimus;" cf. xii. 22. 2: "De Rutilia quoniam videris dubitare, scribes ad me cum scies, sed quam primum, et num Clodia D. Bruto consulari, filio suo, mortuo vixerit;" and xii. 24. 2: "Ut ad meas ineptias redeam, velim me certiorem facias, P. Crassus, Venuleiae filius, vivone P. Crasso consulari, patre suo, mortuus sit, ut ego meminisse videor, an post; item quaero de Regillo, Lepidi filio, rectene meminerim patre suo mortuum." Müller in his *Testimonia* quotes from *Ad Att.* xii. 24. 2 a number of questions relating to the embassy of Carneades, probably on account of the words with which they are introduced, "ut scias me ita dolere, ut non iaceam." I should hardly consider this sufficient ground for assuming that this information was desired for the *Consolatio;* it is difficult to see to what use it could have been put in a consolation. It seems better to take it with Tyrrell and Purser, *ad loc.*, as intended for the *Academica*. If we may trust the first quotation, the *Consolatio* was already written when the questions were asked (note the last sentence). Were these examples really then in the *Consolatio?* Riccoboni argued that they were not, because Hieronymus does not include them in his list; Sigonius argued that they were, for they were afterward used by Seneca. Hieronymus' enumeration, with its indefinite plurals, does not give the impression that he is trying or pretending to make his list complete, and in the absence of surer indications it is safer to assume that they were in the *Consolatio* and that this information was desired simply to check up the statements already made. This may receive some support from the "ut ego meminisse videor" of xii. 24. 2. Caepio and Crassus are mentioned, with greater detail than these letters alone could supply, in sec. 102 of our *Consolatio;* Regillus may be represented by Lepidi in the same section. Other *exempla* occur, some probably not found elsewhere in the same use as here, and perhaps in some cases it would be difficult to find a source, if this is a forgery. A noteworthy example is the *laudatio* of Fabius Maximus, on which see above, p. 17. "Where," triumphantly exclaimed Sigonius, "could a forger have found the oration of Fabius Maximus?" It was known, of course, in the days of Cicero (*Cato Mai.* 4. 12). Some of these *exempla* formed part of the rhetorical stock in trade, and so can hardly be used in proof of anything. Perhaps some of those mentioned really come under this head. Yet the resemblance in form is so striking that the more plausible explanation seems to be the one I have given. It is a difficult matter to decide what equipment an earlier age had, to know whether a Sigonius, or harder yet, a Barzizza, could have commanded the necessary information. If our *Consolatio* is ancient, the knowledge would have been easy enough to acquire.

Let us return for a moment to *Ad Att.* xii. 22. 2: "De Rutilia, quoniam videris dubitare, scribes ad me, cum scies, sed quam primum, et num Clodia, D. Bruto consulari, filio suo, mortuo vixerit. Id de Marcello aut certe de Postumia sciri potest, illud autem de M. Cotta aut de Syro aut de Satyro." Tyrrell and Purser, *ad loc.*, say that in the last sentence quoted *de* means "from" four times, "concerning" once ("de M. Cotta"). "Syrus and Satyrus," the note continues, "were no doubt literary slaves belonging to Atticus." If this note be correct, M. Cotta is another *exemplum*, who is not mentioned in our *Consolatio*. But is their interpretation the true one? *Illud*, as Tyrrell and Purser say, clearly refers to the question regarding Rutilia, who was the mother of C. Cotta. It seems strange that Cicero should have allowed *de* to behave so in shifting its meaning. Klotz, alone among the editions I have consulted, reads "aut de M. Cotta," and this may be the right reading. Here, as in so many cases, one would like to know with precision the reading of the MSS. Paleographically, nothing is easier than the confusion of *aut* and *autem* (written with an abbreviation). However, it is unnecessary to make the change. No *aut* precedes "de Marcello," and there need be none here. An M. Cotta is known from Caesar *Bell. civ.* i. 30. 2 and *Ad Att.* x. 16. 3, but we know nothing about his life to lead us to infer that he would be a suitable *exemplum*. He might have been the nephew of C. Cotta, son of Rutilia. What more natural than that in a matter of family history an appeal for information should be made to a member of that family? It is easier and more plausible to translate this *de*, "from," like the rest than to make a new *exemplum*, M. Cotta, or to emend to read C. Cotta in our passage. We need not then regard this as a proof of spuriousness.

Some of the poetic quotations in our *Consolatio* are worth noticing. Among the most interesting are the Ennius epitaph and the verses referring to Telamon. Both are found elsewhere in Cicero, the former in *Tusc.* i. 15. 34 and *Cato Mai.* 20. 73; the latter in *Tusc.* i. 18. 39 and *Ad fam.* ix. 26. 2. Perhaps the most instructive is the second. In the *Tusculans*, Cicero uses the words in their reference to Telamon (Ribbeck I. *Inc. Fab.* 50). In the letter cited, it has humorous reference to Cicero himself. It seems doubtful whether Cicero, having used the quotation jokingly in a letter dated 46, would have used it seriously of himself so soon thereafter in the *Consolatio*, and then seriously of another in the *Tusculans*.

It will hardly seem to anyone, I think, that much can be safely inferred from the fact that the consolatory commonplaces are expressed everywhere in very similar language. It is then unsafe to assume, on this basis alone, that one document is the source for another.

Too much attention has usually been paid, I am convinced, in discussions of this kind, to questions of style and language. While it is obvious that such questions cannot be neglected, their evidence cannot always be regarded as decisive. The choice of words in any author will be dictated at different times by different considerations, and the preservation of individual words from Roman times to ours is conditioned by too many external circumstances. It is true that in the discussion of a document like our *Consolatio*, the presence of a large number of non-Ciceronian words, so called, would be suspicious. On the other hand, the nature of the subject renders a certain resemblance to other works inevitable, and we must guard against error in either direction. With the proviso that I personally do not attach so much importance to this kind of evidence as to some others, I present for the sake of completeness the results of lexicographical studies in our *Consolatio*. Riccoboni of course made much of this argument, though he did not cite all the words which the possession of better apparatus enables us to give. For this particular case, the exception made by him needs to be regarded, obvious misprints are not to be considered, but the absence of MSS makes the text largely a matter of conjecture, and makes it impossible to know whether we have the genuine text. I cite first the words which seem not to occur elsewhere in Cicero: (8) "vagitus," used by Pliny, Ovid, Martial, Celsus; (19) "profligatio," not in the sense of "loss" before Ausonius; (19) "captivitas," found in Seneca and Tacitus; cf. Madvig on Orelli *Cic. fragg.*, p. 71; (21) "deside," in Livy and Columella; (28) "compage," always in the plural in Cicero, though Lucretius and Lucan use it in the singular; (29) "exanimis," Virgil, Livy, *et al.;* (31) "immerentes," Nepos, Horace, Suetonius, Lucretius, Valerius Flaccus; (33) "infeliciter," Terence, Livy, Quintilian, Seneca; (45) "indecentius;" (52) "pharmacorum," in Gellius and Nonius; (62) "osor" and "detractor," the former in Plautus and Apuleius, the latter in Tacitus; (74) "putris;" (98) "nuncupatio," Suetonius, Tacitus, Pliny, Valerius Maximus, on which see above, p. 32; (101) "ultio," Petronius, Seneca, Tacitus; (106) "laetabundus," in Gellius; (107) "confossum," no example in Merguet, though Forcellini cites it from *Sulla* 11; (113) "elucescit," in Lactantius and Augustine, while "eluceo" occurs in Cicero; (124) "sublime" used in Cicero only adverbially, though freely elsewhere as an adjective; (133) "expavescere," Pliny, Suetonius; (160) "letalis," Virgil, Statius, Pliny, *et al.;* (162) "confectrix," which appears only in Lactantius *Inst.* vii. 11. 5, which however is based on *Pro Marc.* 6; (164) "socordia," in Plautus, Auctor ad Herennium, Livy, *et al.;* (175) "immitis," used by Horace, Livy, Virgil; (197) "Lacedaemones," while Cicero has only "Lacedaemonii," according

to Forcellini and Orelli *Onomasticon;* (203) "imperitia," Sallust, Tacitus; (208) "cepas" and "allia," both cited only in the Grammarians; (209) "absurditas," only in Claudianus Mamertinus. In some cases phrases are used in unusual ways, or with infrequent meanings, or seem suggested by other phrases: (1) "adhibere" in the active seems not to govern the dative in Cicero, but instead *ad* with the accusative, e. g., *Tusc.* iv. 29. 63; the dative is used regularly with the passive, as *Tusc.* iv. 27. 59; (1) "subvenire" ("calamitati") may be an imitation of *De off.* i. 24. 63; (2) "gubernaculum" is never used of the mind, but frequently of the ship of state; (3) "conditam eloquentiam;" (4) "in oculis ferebamus;" (8) "infantia" in Cicero seems always to mean lack of skill in speaking, and is not used of an *aetas* before Quintilian; (9) "odium conflatum," cf. *Pro Cluent.* 29. 79, "invidiam conflatam;" (14) "calamitatem contrahere," cf. *Ad fam.* ii. 16. 5, "molestias contrahere;" (25) "indagare," never in Cicero with a clause; (26) "conglutinare," never of marriage, but of friendship in *Lael.* 9. 32; (44) "obduruisse ad," the usual phrase being "obd. contra." Sigonius called attention to the use by Petrarch (*Lett. sen.* x. 4) of "obduruisse" and "occaluisse" in the same sentence. Both are used elsewhere in Cicero, but not used together. It is not a necessary assumption from Petrarch's language that he found them together. The meaning and rarity of the words will account sufficiently for their association. It may be noted that Petrarch uses "obd. contra." It can be shown that Petrarch did not know the *Consolatio* (below, p. 56); whether he knew our *Consolatio* and believed it spurious cannot be ascertained. (60) "Velarunt" always used literally in Cicero, and not figuratively before Seneca and Pliny the Younger; (69) "fortunae temeritate" may be suggested by *De nat. deorum* iii. 24. 61; (70) "lacrimis temperare," cf. the same phrase in Tac. *Ann.* v. 16; (85) "callum obducit," cf. the same phrase with apologetic *quasi* in *Tusc.* ii. 15. 36; (124) "collecticios," the same phrase is used in *Ad. fam.* vii. 3. 2; (129) "in gyrum fortitudinis ac patientiae," cf. *De off.* i. 26. 90, "tamquam in gyrum rationis et doctrinae" in the same context; (143) "actio" is hardly used in the sense demanded here: cf. Lebreton, *La langue de Cicéron, s. v.*, and Nettleship *Contributions to Latin Lexicography, s. v.;* (144) "corporis admixtione solutus," cf. *Cato Mai.* 22. 80; (144) "gravitas" is used in an unusual sense; (146) "in mediis doloribus et aerumnis obdormiscere," cf. *Tusc.* i. 49. 117, "in mediis vitae laboribus obdormiscere;" (146) "satos et creatos," the same words are used in *Tusc.* i. 49. 118; (149) "ficta et adumbrata," the same words in *Lael.* 26. 97; (152) "pugnare contra" seems to be used in the *Orations* only; (159) "degenti" is not used without "aetatem," "vitam," etc., though frequently

with them; (170) "fibras doloris evellendas," cf. *Tusc.* iii. 6. 13, "fibras miseriarum evellere;" (175) "cum hanc ex animis nostris opinionem veluti immitem quandam et immanem beluam extraxerimus," cf. *Acad.* ii. 34. 108, "ut feram et immanem beluam, sic ex animis nostris adsensionem . . . . extraxisset;" (198) "qui reconditas eorum scrutantur litteras," cf. *Tusc.* i. 13. 29, "si vero scrutari vetera . . . . coner," in the same context.

In general, then, one would say that the vocabulary was Ciceronian, in some cases suspiciously so, but that the number of words that are not found in extant works of Cicero was rather large. With these are to be included the words and phrases that are used in non-Ciceronian senses. Most of the words that are not found in Cicero come into use during the next century and a half, or are earlier. Of course the fact that a word does not happen to be found in any extant work of Cicero does not prove that he never used the word. That is a commonplace of criticism. It is only by cumulative evidence of that kind that an impression is formed. A study of the syntax does not yield any striking results. Most notable among the verb uses not already mentioned is the fairly frequent use of *quamquam* with the subjunctive, and the Ciceronian indicative, side by side. Among the case constructions, interesting is the following: "Quid his feminis faciam?" (108), with which cf. *Ad fam.* xiv. 4. 3, "quid Tulliola mea fiet?" With the active forms the regular construction is *de* with the ablative.

Still more unsatisfactory is the evidence of style. The qualities of style are too elusive, the judgment of style too dependent on subjective considerations, to render such arguments convincing. I shall therefore waive all arguments, on whichever side they might be, that are based on style alone. Such discussions too frequently degenerate into mere statement and denial.

Important results of various kinds have followed the revival of interest in metrical *clausulae*, one of which has been the discovery of a valuable test for authenticity, as Zielinski ("Das Clauselgesetz in Ciceros Reden," *Phil. Supplbd.* IX. 806 ff.) has suggested. (The present application of the test is, however, independent of Zielinski's suggestion.) The use of a clausule by Cicero in his formal works is so constant that we can hardly suppose it to have been otherwise in his *Consolatio*. It will be remembered that Cicero himself says that his *Consolatio* gave no indications of the strain under which it was written (*Ad Att.* xii. 21. 5), and this statement is confirmed by Lactantius (*Inst.* i. 15. 21 ff.). Lactantius, it is true, might have been unduly influenced by Cicero's own judgment, and might, moreover, be thinking of the document under consideration, but it need hardly be assumed that Cicero's use of a clausule would be materially affected by his

grief. The surest test would probably be a thorough examination of the *Tusculans* and other works of the same period. If our *Consolatio* proves to have clausules closely resembling those of admittedly genuine works of Cicero, the fact will point toward the genuineness of the document, though we must be on our guard against very skilful imitation of Cicero's *clausulae*. On the contrary, divergence in any considerable degree from Cicero's usage will argue in favor of the spuriousness of the document, and more strongly than the opposite case would for genuineness.

Let us then examine the text. Despite the unsatisfactory condition of Nobbe's text as regards punctuation, I have followed it closely, to avoid, so far as possible, subjective influences, including, however, only the larger subdivisions.[1] In sec. 66 I have read *amisimus* with Klotz where Nobbe has *omisimus;* I have made no other changes except that genitives singular of nouns in *-ius* and *-ium* are read with ending *-i*, not *-ii*, as printed in Nobbe. It is indisputable that good *clausulae* do exist. Such are, for example, (4) ante*a movebamur;* (13) *sustinet munera;* (7) *multis tractata sunt;* (21) *pluribus disputare;* (28) be*atum audent nominare.* Metrically equivalent examples without coincidence of word- and group-accent are: (38) angu*lus relinquatur;* (3) legi*mus necessario;* (16) *viventem mortuum;* (95) omni*no dolendum fuisse;* (23) *praesentis instituti.* The prevailing forms of *clausulae* in our *Consolatio* are these: (*a*) double trochee, usually without the cretic basis; (*b*) cretic followed by spondee or trochee; (*c*) double cretic; (*d*) cretic preceded by certain combinations; (*e*) heroic clausule, comment on which will be made later. Forms derived from these by resolution and substitution will be considered with them. I desire to say in advance that I personally do not regard as proper *clausulae* all the forms that follow.

a) The type (2) va*lere possis* is most common, but the form (1) *nobis ipsis* is also of frequent occurrence, while the preceding cretic basis is often omitted. Examples of its use have been cited. Few other modifications are found: these are represented by (1) *calamitati;* (97) cogi*tare potuit;* (47) reiecimus *minime angit,* where we must choose between the assumption of hiatus and the admission of another case of the heroic clausule.

b) More varieties are found of this class. The forms (4) ante*a movebamur* and (63) *essent immissi* are most common. The quantitative equivalent of the last example is (40) congres*sus vel complexus*, in which the relation of the clausule-accent to the word-accent is not clear, a relation which I do not care to discuss. Frequently one of the long syllables is resolved:

[1] The smaller word-groups do not consistently, or even commonly, reveal a metrical form.

(14) *fuerit aerumna;* (1) levi*ora faciamus;* (59) sae*pissime cupiat;* from resolution of the substituted long comes (87) consue*tudine vincetur*. Various other forms occur in which one long syllable is resolved, while from the resolution of two long syllables might result such examples as (19) effi*cere miseriorem;* (146) *praemia statuerunt*, with resolution of a substituted long; (93) ela*bi non facile queat*, notable for the reason that one of the resolved syllables is represented by parts of two words, *-le que-*, as is also the case in (140) pro*ducere liceret*, like levi*ora faciamus*, (81) *sustinere queat*, of the type of sae*pissime cupiat*, and (124) omni*a mala revocare*, like effi*cere miseriorem*. Various other products of the resolution of two syllables are represented by a few, or by single, examples. From the resolution of three long syllables might be conceived to result (42) *hominem⁀esse meminerit*, if such a combination can rightly be called a clausule.

c) The regular form (13) *sustinet munera* is common, while all the three possible forms with substitution are found: (7) *multis tractata sunt;* (69) mu*tationem possit;* (92) *extorqueri nolunt*. The last two are rare. Resolutions of the simple type are not common, the most frequent form being (214) ho*nore decoravero*. Two of the original long syllables are resolved in such cases as (18) ge*neribus hominum loquar*, and a few others. Resolutions of the type *multis tractata sunt* are not uncommon: (203) expo*sita censeri potest;* (15) lau*dabilis est maxime*, in which the substituted long is resolved. Sometimes the form mu*tationem possit* is resolved, as in (21) *maxime sollicitat;* rarely the form *extorqueri nolunt*, as in (201) *multis afferre solet*. Not infrequently in all classes two long syllables are resolved, as in (194) homi*nibus facile cernitur*, while possibly into a form with three long syllables resolved might be brought such a collocation as (186) *cognitione posita sit*.

d) A large number of examples exhibit the form of (77) e*lapsus esset filius;* about a dozen the similar su*orum carnificem vocent* (69); and a few the form (59) sapien*tissimi testimonio*.

e) About forty cases are most plausibly to be explained as heroic clausules, a very large number as compared with Zielinski's figures for the *Orations*. Some of these, disregarding the matter of accent, might be put into other classes, e. g., (4) *ipsis medeamur;* (35) prudenti*ae documenta*. It is hard to explain away such cases as (16) patien*terque tulisse*, (204) *commemorare*, (65) *sollicitudo*, etc. There remains a score of cases which it is impossible to refer to any type, however generous one be in admitting substitutions and resolutions.

Before passing on, let us comment briefly on the facts presented. No such elaborate classification as that of Zielinski has been attempted: the

nature of the problem rendered that unnecessary. Yet even with the simpler scheme here used, difficulties have arisen. Very troublesome has been the relation of the word- and clausule-accent. The method of procedure and the disposition of individual examples might differ if it were settled whether the Latin accent were one of stress or of pitch, at least for formal Latin, as Abbott has recently argued ("The Accent in Vulgar and Formal Latin," *Class. Phil.* II. 444 ff.). From ignorance of this relation arises the uncertainty with regard to many cases. Our problem, however, is not to ascertain what *clausulae* are used, but, first of all, whether they are used. What will be our answer? Apparently there are *clausulae* more or less in accordance with Ciceronian usage. It is perhaps questionable whether excessive liberties have not been taken with them. The most serious problem in a study of this kind is the determination of the permissible variants. Substitutions and resolutions undoubtedly do occur in the most formal works of Cicero: the well-known fondness for the *esse videatur* type is sufficient proof. Aggregations of syllables like (42) *hominem esse meminerit* and (186) *cognitione posita sit* are quantitative equivalents of good *clausulae*, yet it is hard to believe that they are clausules in the proper sense of the term. The almost metrical movement of (77) *elapsus esset filius* (an *L*-clausule) may be observed in groups of other forms, e. g., (96) *anteferre debeamus*.

In Zielinski's tables, the proportion of *V*- and *L-clausulae* is about 86 per cent.; in our *Consolatio*, with a most liberal interpretation, the proportion of *clausulae* of the same types as he includes would not exceed 55 per cent. Such a situation speaks strongly against the Ciceronian authorship of our *Consolatio*. Can it help us to date the document? Perhaps. The use of *clausulae* may prove to conform to their use at some of the periods to which the composition of our *Consolatio* may be attributed.[1]

A few miscellaneous points remain to be considered. Attention was directed above (p. 30) to the passage which relates to the orator Crassus. In the following section (120), which continues the narrative, occur these words: "Tenemus enim memoria, aut saltem ex patrum scriptis accepimus, crudelissimam omnium caedem illo tempore esse factam," etc. For a commentary I need only refer to Mr. Hendrickson's studies in method of citation (*A. J. P.* XXVII, No. 2). Gulielmus pointed out long ago that Cicero's own boyhood reached back to the time under consideration, but the technical feature did not present itself to him.

In some cases there may be observed what seemed to the early critics Christian points of view. Perhaps the most suspicious of these is the following (112): "tamen multo maioribus et bonis et opibus, quae nulla

[1] The *clausulae* for chaps. i–xviii are given in full in Appendix B.

vetustas absumet, nulla vis eripiet, piorum mentes assidue potiuntur." The early students of the question were chiefly concerned with the discussion of immortality contained in our *Consolatio*, and in the maze of assertion and denial we do not care to follow them far. It does not seem that the author has gone beyond the limits of the philosophers in any notable degree. Philosophy, argues Sigonius, was God's gift to the Greeks, as the Law to the Hebrews, and we must not wonder if their philosophers attained to some of the exalted conceptions usually associated with Christianity. Such a statement as the following may seem at first surprising (38): "qui enim nascentium curam suscipiunt, qui viventes protegunt, alunt, tuentur, fovent, cur morientes deserant?" Yet even this can find a starting-point in the famous words of Socrates (Plato *Apol.* 41 CD), thus translated by Cicero (*Tusc.* i. 41. 99), whence an imitator would most naturally derive them: "nec enim cuiquam bono mali quicquam evenire potest nec vivo nec mortuo, nec umquam eius res a dis immortalibus negliguntur." The statement that life is but an inn is frequent enough in ancient literature, e. g., *Cato Mai.* 23. 64 (see *Cons.* 45).

Other bits of evidence of various sorts may be deduced from the preceding discussions, and the body of evidence presented makes no claim to completeness. It is hoped, however, that a sufficient mass of representative evidence has been offered to allow a decision of our question. Let us then pass in review the material collected, to draw our inferences as the evidence demands.

The study of the fragments gives little sure evidence either way. Such value as they have for this purpose was shown in the discussion on pp. 25 ff. In some respects, their testimony is against the theory of authenticity. In one case, our *Consolatio* hardly agrees with the account of the fragment given in Lactantius, which, incidentally, may make against the theory that Lactantius used this as the genuine *Consolatio*. It may be mentioned in passing that the evidence of the fragments generally is against the theory of a Sigonian origin, as in cases of difference they agree with Patricius and not with Sigonius. In the last fragment discussed, it agrees with neither, but the change is so slight that inference is unsafe. The fact that the fragments occur in the order adopted by Sigonius is hardly significant. Sigonius or one of his contemporaries might intentionally have followed or altered the order adopted in the printed collection. It is still possible that these fragments might have been arranged in this way independently of Sigonius. The order itself is not unnatural or impossible. The testimony of the fragments, then, cannot be regarded as decisive, though it favors the theory of spuriousness rather than the opposite.

Perhaps we may reach more definite conclusions when we come to consider the relation, in language and thought, of our *Consolatio* to other works of Cicero. I have stated with sufficient fulness my belief that resemblance in form does not necessarily imply relationship, and still less the direction of the indebtedness, in case one is otherwise shown to exist. Yet it would seem that in the case of our *Consolatio* and the *Tusculans*, at least, a relation must be assumed, to account for the striking similarities that were pointed out above. A connection between the genuine *Consolatio* and the *Tusculans* is necessary, as was shown above (p. 1). If this were the genuine *Consolatio*, the decisive argument would be the time of completion of the two works. As we are not sure whether or no this is the genuine, we must not consider the time element. Which, then, of the various theories will most plausibly explain what seem to be the facts? Such large agreements cannot reasonably be explained as coincidences. Shall we say that the similarity is due to the fact that both are products of the same mind, that our *Consolatio* imitates the *Tusculans*, or the *Tusculans* our *Consolatio?* It is difficult to establish certain standards of imitation. We have already rejected the comparison of style. Yet we must, if possible, render a verdict on this point. If we cannot tell with certainty from the passages themselves, the question of motive would enter into the discussion. Would Cicero, having written the *Consolatio* early in 45, have allowed himself to repeat the language of the *Consolatio* to this extent in the *Tusculans*, written within the next year, at least? The chances are, it seems to me, that he would not have done so. While it is easy enough to parallel the use by Cicero of the same ideas in different places, never, so far as I am aware, does he repeat his own words so exactly, or his thoughts with such close attention to detail. This would argue either our *Consolatio* or the *Tusculans* a forgery. The genuineness of the *Tusculans* can hardly be challenged successfully. All the evidence is in favor of its authenticity. In addition to the testimony of the MSS, the description of its contents by Cicero in *De div.* ii. 1. 2 has sufficient detail to make it clear that the work is genuine. On the other hand, our *Consolatio* lacks this external support. The evidence of the MSS is, so far as we know, wanting, its history incomplete and suspicious. The clear tradition of the *Tusculans* is absent. The probability is that the author of our *Consolatio* is the imitator. Let us see whether this general conclusion can be supported by individual arguments. The variation in the forms of the Silenus story in the two places does not speak eloquently against the agreement in so many other particulars. The similarity in the list of *exempla* is insignificant as compared with the remarkable resemblance in form, especially in the cases of Pompey and Priam. It

is perhaps fanciful to suggest that the statements regarding Priam in the *Tusculans* answer almost word for word the rhetorical questions in our *Consolatio*. The only inference one could safely draw from the differences in the Decii story would be that it is unlikely that Cicero would have used different versions in the *Consolatio* and the *Tusculans*, particularly as the former was a source for the latter. I have commented above on the possible relations of the author to Valerius Maximus and to Hieronymus (p. 32). Nothing is settled by this, by reason of the possibility that our *Consolatio*, though a forgery, precedes them, and was used by them as the genuine. The evidence from the requests for information made to Atticus is not convincing, on account of the uncertainty as to the use to which some of the information is to be put. Among the quotations the most interesting is the one beginning "cuius ob os." For this an explanation was suggested above (p. 34). The mixture of figures in sec. 72 (above, p. 31) is perhaps not without significance, when one thinks of the possible sources of the ideas, both of which are intelligible by themselves, and are found independently. With regard to the Latinity of the document, the vocabulary is more significant than the syntax. Striking contrasts exist, the startling use of Ciceronian words and phrases in the same form, or nearly the same, as found elsewhere, and the fairly large number of non-Ciceronian words. It is hardly credible that in a genuine work of this character such a situation would exist. Cicero would hardly have ventured such wholesale repetitions so soon in the *Tusculans*. The syntax, like the vocabulary, would seem to belong to a date not earlier than the first or second century A. D., and possibly much later. The *clausulae* can scarcely be called Ciceronian. Good clausules certainly are found, but this does not necessarily mean that the author used them as Cicero would have used them. The state of affairs in the *Tusculans*, where the greatest resemblance might be expected, is quite different. The heroic clausule, which, like other poetic forms, was usually avoided, is here freely used. The number of examples that proved irreconcilable with recognized forms is fairly large, especially if there be added to this list the considerable number of peculiar endings. More than this, the proportion of good *clausulae* is far less than in genuine works of Cicero, 55 per cent. as compared with 86 per cent. in the *Orations*. One other point, of considerable interest, remains. Among the large group that are not real clausules there are some that may be reclaimed by adopting another theory and regarding them as rhythmical. Many quantitative *clausulae*, though not all, will exhibit no clash of word- and group-accent, and so could be either quantitative or rhythmical. Other *clausulae* which are quantitatively correct will correspond to different rhythmical forms.

Still others which are quantitative failures will be, rhythmically considered, good *clausulae*. Examples of the first class are (21) *pluribus disputare;* (216) mor*talium consecrabo;* (39) conse*quentis aetatis*, etc. In the case of these, one may not decide whether the clausule has a quantitative or a rhythmical basis; the same is true of the second class, of which I now give examples: (97) ser*mone persequitur*, which if quantitative, belongs to class *b*) above, if rhythmical, corresponds to the quantitative class *c*); the same is true of (148) dubitati*one perfruitur*. These examples need not then be considered accentual, and the question whether to consider them so can, for our purposes, be answered only when the relation of the word- and clausule-accent is determined. The third class includes a fair number of cases, e. g., (194) *facile cernitur;* (35) *quibus expediat;* (2) *corporis indiget;* (150) *facile cederent;* (94) *magis idonea;* etc., which have a suspicious resemblance to the mediaeval *cursus*. The possible bearing of this on the date of our *Consolatio* will come up later. The presence of such *clausulae* here in considerable numbers is to my mind almost conclusive proof that our *Consolatio* is not genuine. Various interesting questions suggest themselves. Is the presence of *clausulae* here a mere chance? Did the author try consciously to imitate Cicero in the matter of *clausulae*, as in so many other respects, but meet with only partial success? Does the work date from a time when the study of *clausulae* was still in its infancy, and the Ciceronian clausule not well understood? Was the author so at home in Latin that clausules came naturally and unconsciously to him? Possibly an answer to these questions can be found.

The single specimen of the author's method of citation revealed a naïveté that is quite un-Ciceronian. The other bits of evidence were not conclusive. Our general conclusion would seem to be that the work is a forgery. Will this assumption explain the facts? An imitator, working with a private or public collection of fragments or with the real *Consolatio*, might perfectly well have woven these extracts into the fabric of the narrative so as to make a complete and harmonious whole. The relation to the *Tusculans* can plausibly be explained only on the theory that the work is a forgery. With the exception of the *Tusculans*, which would naturally be the main source of an imitator, the relations are in general most close with those authors who were well known at all times. The author's weakness lies in his too great fondness for Ciceronian phraseology, which led him into excesses of imitation. An interesting and perhaps significant example is afforded by *Cons.* 41 and *Ad Att.* xii. 21. 5, quoted above, p. 14. The Cicero of the letter is willing *accipere medicinam*, the Cicero of our *Consolatio*, not only *accipere, sed etiam exquirere, medicinam*. This is perhaps

the clearest expression of a desire on the part of our author to outdo the Cicero we know from other sources in resolute endurance of misfortune, a steadfastness of which the real Cicero, in real misfortune, was not capable. In the case of the "cuius ob os" quotation, his memory or his knowledge failed him, and he committed, as a result, a tactical blunder. The language and syntax are what we might expect from a student of a later age, who had steeped himself in Cicero, perhaps for the purpose of forging this document. We should compliment the forger on the skill with which he has done his work. Max Müller is said to have read our *Consolatio* with no idea that it was spurious, though the impression is not that which one gets from Cicero's philosophical works generally, and Farrer (*Literary Forgeries*, p. 5) calls it "as well worth reading as many of Cicero's undoubted works." As for the motive for the forgery, it is hard to say what it might have been. A rhetorical exercise of more than usual extent and formality might have been the intention. Conceivably it was a deliberate falsification. In the present state of our knowledge it is impossible to make out the real purpose.

While it is possible that no one piece of evidence that has been presented will carry with it unreserved conviction that our *Consolatio* is spurious, the total effect would seem to me to be decisive. We have tried in the consideration of details to keep the point of view of scientific objectivity and impartiality. We can now afford to let our judgment that is based on less tangible evidence confirm, modify, or refute our other conclusions. Despite Max Müller, I fancy that there will be little objection to the opinion that this impression confirms the belief that our *Consolatio* is not genuine.

Assuming our *Consolatio* to be a forgery, we shall be able to explain the reference to the "fanum" which Cicero proposed to build to the memory of Tullia. Despite the enthusiasm which Cicero felt for the project, there is no evidence that it was ever carried into execution. The reader of the twelfth book of the letters to Atticus would naturally assume, if he depended entirely on that source, that the shrine had been built. Our *Consolatio* seems to state distinctly that the shrine had been constructed, whereas letters of later date than the composition of the *Consolatio* show that Cicero was still in doubt as to the best means of carrying out his plans. The language of our *Consolatio* seems to demand more than the simple determination to build the fane.

To sum up: The impression one gets from the reading of our *Consolatio* is that it is not a work of Cicero. This impression receives support, in greater or less degree, from various kinds of evidence. Among the most important of these are the following: The text tradition of our *Consolatio* is unsatisfactory and incomplete. Waiving the internal evidence, external

considerations must prove that the author of our *Consolatio* imitated the *Tusculans*, and not the opposite. Neither the Latinity nor the use of *clausulae* can be regarded as Ciceronian. Furthermore, the theory of spuriousness enables us to explain the facts more easily and naturally than does the theory of genuineness.

CHAPTER V

CONJECTURES AS TO THE AUTHOR

The second part of our inquiry is now in order—the attempt to discover, if possible, the real author, or at least the era in which he lived. It should be said in advance that the prospects for reaching a satisfactory conclusion on this point are few, for many and obvious reasons. All I shall try to do here is to present the evidence, as far as it can be done, and not attempt to influence the reader's decision. The principal conjectures are five, as follows: (1) The author was Vianello, (2) The author was Sigonius, or someone who depended on Sigonius for information; (3) The author was Gasparino Barzizza; (4) The document is a forgery, but ancient; (5) The document is a forgery, and dates from the Renaissance.

The first theory is of uncertain origin. As the easiest to dispose of, let us consider it first. It is true that Vianello was the publisher of the first edition, that he displayed a singular lack of partisan enthusiasm for our *Consolatio* that is unusual for a man of his time, and has aroused suspicions, and that he failed to keep his promises to produce the MS. Yet this "ignobilis librarius" was hardly the man, from what we can learn of him, to undertake and carry to such a successful conclusion a forgery of this magnitude. The possibility must remain that Vianello was the author, yet the theory has little more than the possibility to recommend it.

A much more difficult problem meets us when we come to the second proposition. The evidence against Sigonius is striking, and to some may seem convincing, even though we would regret to see a scholar of Sigonius' reputation convicted on such a charge. Gulielmus seems to have been the first to suggest that Sigonius was implicated. See his *Assertio adversus C. Sigonium*, pp. 113 ff., and above, p. 8. Certainly no scholar of his generation was better equipped than Sigonius. His study of the fragments had given him a control of the material that none of his contemporaries could claim. The task of forging would have been much lighter after the genuine fragments had been published. It is true that the fragments as they occur in our *Consolatio* resemble more closely those of Patricius than those of Sigonius. This may easily be explained. The collection may be independent. Sigonius might have hit upon this device to divert suspicion. In that case, the fact that the fragments occur in the Sigonian order might be due to pride, to an oversight, or to intentional ingenuousness.

I quoted above, p. 8, some letters that show an almost personal inter-

est in our *Consolatio* which it is difficult to explain on any other theory than this. Schulz, who does not believe that Sigonius is the author, but who desires to prove an existence for the book prior to 1583, quotes from a letter of Sigonius, dated November 12, 1582, in which he speaks of "un mio libro de consolatione." Tiraboschi takes this to be a confession, and such surely would be the first inference. It is questionable whether it is the correct one. All the letters must be explained together, if possible. The question of the actual date of publication here becomes of some importance. Schulz takes the explanation to be that a few copies had been sent out to favored individuals as early as the date of this letter, though the edition proper did not appear till the next year. As he believes in the existence of a MS, his explanation seems not altogether necessary. He seems to have overlooked the considerations I adduced above (p. 7) to the effect that the actual date of publication must be earlier than is usually believed, or at least the date at which it became known to the learned world. We shall have to go back then to the meaning of "mio." Unquestionably it might and probably naturally would imply more than a purely academic interest. My tables of *clausulae* of Sigonius are so imperfect that I hesitate to generalize. My collections reveal a mixture of quantitative and accentual *clausulae* with endings that are impossible from either standpoint, the rhythmical clausules in greater numbers, relatively, than in our *Consolatio*. On occasion, however, Sigonius used a regular accentual clausule. In a letter to H. Stephanus (quoted by Krebs *Carl Sigonius*, 1840, and communicated to me by Professor Hendrickson) we find such *clausulae* as these: *tabulas collegisti; potius admiratus;* occasi*onem quaesiveris; studium delectaret;* litter*arum officium;* sig*nificas provocaris; valde probavi; impulit multo magis; proficiscuntur; potest contingere*, etc. My own lists are mainly from the *De dialogo liber* and the *Oratio in Gymnasio Patavino* (*Opera* VI. 3 ff. and 344 ff., ed. 1757), and reveal no such regularity.[1] Such *clausulae* as are found in our *Consolatio* are, then, not impossible in the time of Sigonius, though the similarity will not alone prove Sigonius the author. Dismissing, with Ellis, and despite Farrer, the rumor of a deathbed confession, which is nothing but a rumor, we still have what must be confessed to be a strong suspicion. Against it may be arrayed some general considerations. The general character and standing of Sigonius are good. I have no desire to repeat the eulogistic characterizations of Schulz and Ellis. Such literary disputes seem to have been quite in keeping with Sigonius' character. He had already indulged in a debate which is now obscure, but evidently at the time enjoyed a certain notoriety, with Robortet. See a letter from

[1] For additional material see Appendix B.

Muretus to Gillot, published by De Nolhac *Correspondance*, etc., p. 149, n. 5; cf. *Mélanges Graux*, p. 400, a letter rather amusing for its slighting reference to Riccoboni. A remark by De Nolhac is worth our consideration (*Correspondance*, etc., pp. 94 ff.): "Sigonio, qui a mesuré mieux que personne le champ de la science, sait trop le prix de temps pour s'abandonner aux exercices littéraires." The present tendency seems away from the theory of a Sigonian authorship; whether rightly or no is a question I do not care to attempt to decide.

Equally difficult to defend or to overthrow is the theory that the author was Gasparino Barzizza, a theory propounded by Schulz in his dissertation. Schulz argues ingeniously in defense of his theory, but it must remain nothing more than an interesting conjecture, in the present state of our knowledge. As Barzizza does not enjoy the fame he deserves, a few words regarding him may not be out of place. He was first and foremost a teacher, lecturing in Bergamo, Pavia, Venice, Padua, Ferrara, and finally at the court of the *visconti* at Milan. Certain things about his career have given rise to false impressions of his scholarship and methods, impressions which it is only just to correct. Schulz (pp. 86 ff.) argues from the well-known Ciceronian studies of Barzizza that he was the author of our *Consolatio*. It is true that he stood in the front rank of the Ciceronians of his day. The whole story of Ciceronianism remains to be written, though some progress has been made. Sabbadini in his *Storia del Ciceronianismo*, p. 13, says: "Ma il vero apostolo del Ciceronianismo fu il Barzizza, 'cuius ductu et auspiciis,' scrivea Guarino nel 1422, 'Cicero amatur, legitur, et per Italorum gymnasia summa cum gloria volitat.'" Doubtless some allowance must be made for humanistic exaggeration, but it is clear that a substantial residue of truth remains. It was natural enough that Gasparino should have been interested in the still fragmentary rhetorical works of Cicero, yet it is this very interest that has been in part responsible for this charge of forgery. How far, if at all, he influenced the texts of Quintilian and Cicero it is difficult to make out, yet what we know of his methods of study does not lead us to believe that he is responsible for serious corruption. The source of this misapprehension seems to be a statement by Flavio Biondo *Italia Illustrata*, p. 346, also quoted by Furietti *Barz. Opp.*, p. xli, and by Schulz, p. 86. Referring to the discovery of a MS of the rhetorical works by Landriani in 1422, he writes: "unde liberatus est bonus ipse vir Gasparinus ingenti, quem assumpserat, labore supplendi, quoad poterat, librorum de Oratore defectus." We are fortunate enough to know a good deal about Gasparino's methods of work on such problems. See Sabbadini *Studi di G. B. su Quintiliano e Cicerone*, p. 10, and a MS note quoted in

Bandini *Cat. Cod. Laur.* II. 492, 493; 499–501: "Hoc supplet Gasparinus, non tamen, ut proprio ex ore audivi, ea intentione ut textui annecteretur, sed ut esset quaedam postilla in margine quae utrosque textus defectuosos coniungeret et cum aliqua continuatione et consonantia saltem intellectui legentis satisfaceret aliquantisper." Cf. also a letter from Barzizza to Ioh. Cornelius, quoted from *Cod. Ricc.* 779, f. 148, by Sabbadini *Studi*, etc., p. 11: "Quaedam etiam cum deficerent supplevi, non ut (*om. cod.*) in versum cum textu Ciceronis ponerentur, esset enim vehementer temerarium nec ab homine docto ferendum, sed ut ea in margine posita commentariorum locum tenerent." In the face of such testimony it seems difficult to convict Gasparino of any design of forgery. The parallel is of course not perfect, but the almost modern conception of a scholar's responsibilities and obligations is certainly to be put down to his credit. Another argument on which Schulz relies is that Gasparino wrote "Epistulae ad exercitationem accommodatae." These letters, of which we have a considerable number, are what their name implies, exercises in Latin composition, cast in epistolary form, dealing with a variety of subjects. They would naturally form part of a teacher's equipment. The only argument that can safely be drawn from these is the habit of practicing Ciceronian Latin, for neither in length nor in content is there any resemblance to our *Consolatio*. All are short. Sabbadini *Ciceronianismo*, p. 16, says of them: "Qui difficilmente si incontra una parola, una frase non ciceroniana; non è sempre ciceroniano il sapore, assai di rado ciceroniano il movimento, perchè lettere di argomento simulato; ma nell' insieme vi è una correttezza, una scrupolosità, di cui prima del Barzizza non si hanno esempi, e ben pochi dopo di lui, finchè non si arriva a Paolo Cortesi"—a characterization, by the way, hardly applicable to our *Consolatio*. Schulz's other arguments are based mainly on the similarity of language in our *Consolatio* and Barzizza. It is however to be noted that the majority of instances of this kind belong in the general consolatory field, and so are imperfect evidence. It must be admitted, too, that while Barzizza was a Ciceronian, he was not in the sense that the author of our *Consolatio* was a Ciceronian, an author who did not scruple to quote with astonishing freedom anything which suited his purpose. In the numerous consolatory letters and funeral orations of Barzizza there is little evidence that he was acquainted with the ancient literature of these types, though we know from his own lips that he was (see below, p. 61). They are far less formal, rhetorically, than those of Poggio, for instance. The style of Barzizza is rather that of a man who was well acquainted with Cicero than of one who borrows outright and shamelessly. For a general judgment on his style, see Sabbadini *Ciceronianismo*, p. 15. We may

find some evidence by inquiring into Barzizza's character and reputation a little more at length. The whole weight of this testimony falls on the side of his innocence. Something of his fame among his contemporaries we can deduce from what has been already said. His scholarly reputation was deservedly good, his private life praiseworthy. If any pecuniary advantage was to be gained by such a composition, it might be attributed with some plausibility to that period of financial depression in the scholar's life before he was received into the favor of the Milanese *visconti*. It is hard to see what financial benefits could have accrued. A pretended discovery by him would hardly have escaped some record, in a time when there was so much enthusiasm for new MSS. In the same connection it may be noted that his reputation brought to him the credit for discoveries he did not make; e. g., the discovery of Cicero's rhetorical works was attributed to him by Raphael Volaterranus *Comment urb.* xxi. 489 (ed. Basil, 1559), and others. He shared in the neglect which his generation received from their successors. With the advent of a generation of editors like Pomponius Laetus, the discoverers went into temporary obscurity. Barzizza, however, fared better than did some others, as Poggio. The former's reputation grew by accretion, while the fame of Poggio's discoveries, which had been the sensation of the learned world, had so diminished that Sabellicus (*Dialogus de reparatione Latinae linguae*, *Opp.*, pp. 190 ff., ed. 1502) was not sure whether Quintilian was discovered by Poggio or by Barzizza. Among the works of Poggio, the *Letters* and *Orations* were known to Sabellicus by name only, the *Facetiae* alone were known to him at first hand, incidentally a sad commentary on the moral standards of the age. Barzizza's commentaries also were believed by Sabellicus to have perished. The *Dialogus* is undated, but probably belongs to the last quarter of the fifteenth century.

We saw a specimen of Barzizza's ideals as a scholar in his methods of supplying lacunae; his attitude toward the *mihi-michi* controversy indicates his scholarship. The majority of scholars of the early fifteenth century, led by Lionardo Bruno, favored the spelling *michi*. Bruno argues with some display of erudition for this spelling, but relies mainly on the fact that Petrarch and Coluccio spelled that way. Gasparino stood out against this spelling, in favor of *mihi*. See also Sabbadini *Ciceronianismo*, pp. 99 ff. A further instance of his scholarship may be seen in his pioneer studies of metrical *clausulae*. The introduction of the study of *clausulae* into modern teaching is sometimes attributed to Lorenzo Valla, but erroneously. This attribution may be found, for example, in Raphael Volaterranus *op. cit.*, p. 490: "Laurentius Valla primus fere nostro saeculo qui

orationem Latinam nulla observatione fluentem in compedes quasi redegerit ac in nervos observationis antiquae constrinxit." But see Barzizza's *De compositione*, *Opp.*, p. 11. Here we find a theoretical exposition of the clausule, with later a practical demonstration of its use, based on Martianus Capella, whose account, he says, is clearer than those of Cicero and Quintilian. Cicero's actual usage, he says, is the best guide. It would seem then that to Barzizza belongs the credit for initial studies in this field. Schulz introduces some very ingenious arguments to support his theory, but the burden of proof must rest with him, nor to my mind, has he succeeded in making out a case. Scharff thought some author of the end of the fifteenth century was responsible, but was unwilling to go farther, and no one has been so daring in the case of the other documents attributed to the Renaissance. Schulz calls attention to the statement of Tiraboschi *Storia della Letteratura Italiana* I, p. 315, note, that a MS of our *Consolatio* was sent to him for examination by a certain Beltramelli of Bergamo. Tiraboschi thinks that this MS was forged by some partisan of Sigonius to give a firmer foundation to his defense, but declares the MS to show manifest signs of being a forgery, being provided with lacunae and other signs of age. This theory of Tiraboschi's is refuted by Schulz, who apparently without knowing that Sigonius asserted the existence of a MS declared that any MS, fragmentary or otherwise, would have been welcomed by Sigonius, had he known of its existence. Certainly we should have expected a higher degree of candor on the part of Sigonius, had he known of this MS. There is of course nothing essentially impossible, or even improbable, in the supposition that this is the three-hundred-year-old MS to which reference has been made. Paleographical references of this period are notoriously inexact, and Tiraboschi is perhaps not infallible on such points. This MS, according to Schulz, p. 97, was written by some friend of Barzizza's, and is another copy of the same MS that was published by Vianello. Being incomplete, it escaped detection until it came into the hands of Beltramelli. His argumentation is far from lucid. An incomplete MS is as liable to discovery as a perfect one, and the existence of the MS at Bergamo in the library of Beltramelli, who was an enthusiastic collector of MSS and rare books, would by no means prove that it had ever been in Bergamo before. The discrepancy in age, in case this was the MS claimed by Vianello to exist, did not concern Schulz, and need not us. There seems little real evidence to connect this MS with either Sigonius or Barzizza. Given a MS, and it would seem that we were far on the way toward a solution of our difficulties. But such is not the case. The library of Beltramelli has been dispersed, and so far it has proved impossible to

locate the MS in question. Part of the collection went to the Capitular Library of Bergamo, part, it appears, to the Biblioteca Trivulziana in Milan. The recently completed catalogue of the latter library, consulted for me by Dr. B. L. Ullman, makes no mention of such a MS as ours. I have been no more successful in the Capitular Library.

The Venice MS of the *Consolatio* (Lat. VI. 11) may be this Beltramelli MS. It presents an interesting and difficult problem. No evidence, from the style or from the content, has so far revealed its true character. It fits well enough the rather vague description of Tiraboschi, as it breaks off abruptly (if my photographs are complete) at the end of a *recto* page (14), and from 9^{r} to the end, lacunae, some with and some without erasure, are frequent. In some places erasures have certainly been made and it is possible to read the original, e. g., on 14^{r}_{11}, where *efialtes* has been erased. It is to be noted that in this passage *efialtes* does not occupy the position in the list of names assigned to it in the editions. In other cases there are apparent erasures, though the underlying reading cannot be made out. In some of these it is quite clear that the original was not the reading of the editions. In other cases spaces are left, in which nothing has been written. To judge from the photographs, these are not the losses which result from age. Furthermore, why should the first quaternion have been spared? The fact that the MS breaks off at the end of a *recto* page proves that the absence of the greater part of the text is due to non-completion, and not to accident. This MS could not then have been the MS of Vianello. Its relation to that MS cannot even be conjectured. Some readings suggest a difference in tradition, e. g., *ex servata civium salute* (14), *summos et infimos* (22), *illud Menadri* (*sic*) *canticum* (61), etc., the editions reading *ex parta civium salute*, *summum et infimum*, *illud comicum*, etc. In most respects it agrees closely with the editions. There are gaps in the external history of the MS. The Marcian library received it from Morelli, a former librarian, who had it as a gift from an Englishman, Edwards. Its earlier history I have not been able to learn, but Valentinelli in his catalogue of the Venice MSS regarded it as Beltramelli's MS, though assigning it to the eighteenth century. If it really was his MS there remains nothing certain to connect it with either Sigonius or Barzizza, and if this date is correct, a connection with either of these men is impossible. The hand, which Valentinelli pronounced an imitation of the fourteenth-century style, is of so peculiar a character, and presents such different forms of individual letters within a few lines that it is very difficult to form an opinion. It is tempting, however, to accept Valentinelli's statement, with perhaps a mental reservation with regard to the date. The conjecture that it imitates

a fourteenth-century style has some merit, though there is no one style, to my knowledge, comparable to this. Its composite character bears some testimony to its lateness. We cannot, therefore, identify with certainty this MS with that seen by Tiraboschi, nor can we regard it as evidence against either Sigonius or Barzizza. Very probably it comes from a time later than either of them.

The material at hand for the study of Barzizza's use of *clausulae* is insufficient.[1] Rhythmical *clausulae* seem, so far as I can judge, to prevail, as one would expect from the time in which he lived. Despite the assumption of the humanists that Latin was their native tongue, it is hard to believe that the use of clausules by them was not conscious, whatever it may have been with Cicero. Especially in the case of Barzizza, who said that the method of use of *clausulae* should depend on circumstances, the fact of the non-use or use of clausules in the passages we should happen to pick in any accidental way would have little real bearing. Schulz jauntily proclaims that nothing can be urged against his theory, but equally plausible arguments could doubtless be devised, with a little ingenuity, to attribute the forgery to other scholars of the Renaissance.

Let us now take up the theory proposed by Ellis, that our *Consolatio* has come down from antiquity, and that it was used as the genuine by Hieronymus and Lactantius. This theory has much to recommend it. Ellis' brief article (*Cl. Rev.* VII. 197) by no means exhausts the possibilities of argument. He regards the style as too classical to have been possible in Sigonius' time, or in the Renaissance (he does not refer to Schulz's conjecture), and particularly before 1432. He regards this date as significant because in that year Ambrogio Traversari, general of the monastic order of the Camaldolese, discovered at Perugia a "Consolatio Ignoti Auctoris" (*Hodoeporicon*, p. 11). Ellis believes that this is our *Consolatio*, and if so, it must be ancient. The resemblance is surely striking, yet we are hardly justified in identifying them on such slight authority. No further reference to the MS is made by Traversari. It is inconceivable that a document purporting to be Ciceronian would have been passed over without mention of that fact, especially as he stops to characterize it briefly. The age as a whole was not critical, though the *De differentiis* was recognized by Coluccio as a forgery. Yet the contrast between the title and the pretensions of the work would surely have struck Traversari. It would be in many ways desirable to identify the two. Sigonius' name would be at once freed from possible taint. Barzizza, who died in 1431, might have been the author of the Traversari *Consolatio*, an argument of which Schulz does not avail

[1] See Appendix B.

himself. Given a MS of the sixteenth century (Tiraboschi) or of the fifteenth (Schulz), and a possible one in the fifteenth (the Traversari MS), with the assertion of the existence of a MS by Vianello and Sigonius, it is tempting to identify them. I know of nothing else with which this MS of Traversari could be identified. The Venice MS can hardly have been Traversari's. On the other hand, the reasons for this identification are not strong. Arguments from silence are rarely convincing. Supposing that our *Consolatio* were the one discovered by Traversari, a chain would be established which would support Ellis' view. The age of the possible Vianellan MS may be left out of account. But the identity of the Traversari MS with that of Vianello is not necessary to the theory, though it would be confirmatory. The language of our *Consolatio* might perfectly well belong to the first or second century A. D. (I should hesitate to say that it necessarily belonged then). One possibility that must be taken into account is that our *Consolatio*, while not genuine, used the real *Consolatio* as a source. In that case, fragments would still be authentic, so far as they are confirmed by other sources. In case this is not true, our whole collection of fragments, save those in the *Tusculans*, is brought into question. Can we decide whether or no Lactantius and Hieronymus used this *Consolatio?* There is some evidence in both cases that they did not. The use of the Silenus story in our *Consolatio* does not quite agree with what Lactantius demands (cf. above, p. 27); the summary grouping of exempla in *Cons.* 102 seems suggested by Hieronymus rather than vice versa (p. 32, above). I pointed out that this *Consolatio* could not be the only source for Valerius Maximus, and therefore need not be regarded as a source at all. Yet the early centuries of the Empire would seem a suitable time for the composition of such an essay. This would agree with the well-known practice of the rhetorical schools. In case the author did not depend on the real *Consolatio* for the material, could we date our *Consolatio* more exactly on this theory? The mass of evidence in Pliny is so slight that it can hardly be taken seriously. I refer to the quotation "Crantorem sequor," which might have been transmitted independently. While the letters to Atticus cannot furnish all the information given in our *Consolatio* about Caepio, Crassus, and the others, it is probable that their insertion in our *Consolatio* is due to this suggestion. The composition of our *Consolatio* would then probably have to be set later than the date of the publication of the letters to Atticus.

Some light may be thrown upon this theory, and the last as well, by an inquiry into the knowledge of the *Consolatio* in the Renaissance. Petrarch had sought long but unsuccessfully for it: cf. his letter to Cicero, *De reb.*

fam. xxiv. 4: "tuorum [*sc.* librorum] sane, quia de iis sermo mihi nunc erat, quorum insignior iactura est, haec sunt nomina: *Reipublicae*, *Rei familiaris*, *De laude philosophiae*, *De consolatione*, *De gloria*," etc. It is of course possible, but not probable, that he knew this *Consolatio*. The only evidence for this is the uncertain manner of the use of *obduruisse* and *occaluisse* (above, p. 36). The researches of the next generation, Poggio and his untiring coworkers, were no more successful, so far as we know. The discovery of Traversari can hardly be considered. Various scholars do display a knowledge of the *Consolatio*. Among these is Lionardo Bruno. I quote from his *Cicero Novus*, preserved, e. g., in *Cod. Laur.* LII. 1: "Scripsit . . . . de senectute, de amicitia, de consolatione libros singulos. . . . . Nec multo post summo ipsum dolore affecit Tulliolae mors quam partu laborantem per id tempus amisit. . . . . Pro linimento huius doloris scriptus est ab eo liber in quo se ipsum consolatus est." It is impossible to judge from such statements whether Bruno had a first-hand knowledge of this or any other *Consolatio*. The same is true of Manetti *Dialogus consolatorius de obitu filii*. The most striking of all is the section of Sicco Polento which deals with Cicero. For this I am indebted to Dr. B. L. Ullman, to a forthcoming paper by whom I would refer the reader. Sicco writes as follows: "Hos quoque per dies ut scriberet de consolatione Tulliolae mors coegit. Tum quidem ut doloris magnitudinem medicina aliqua mitigaret, librum edidit unum, qui de consolatione inscriptus est," etc. He continues with a comment on and analysis of the *Tusculans*. Now it is Sicco's method in the *De viris illustribus* to weave into his characterization a quotation or paraphrase, often from the beginning of the work under discussion. This is true of Catullus, for example: "Id lepide scribit ad Cornelium suum, qui nugas eius aliquid esse putare soleret" (cf. Catull. i. 3–4). This and similar quotations will be discussed in the paper just referred to. The *medicina* here might be such a quotation. Yet the idea of medicine for grief is so common in consolations in Cicero and elsewhere that it is not quite safe to draw conclusions. Sicco was writing about 1430–33, and so would fit in with either the Traversari discovery or the theory that the author was Barzizza. However, it is almost certain that the genuine *Consolatio* was not known to be extant in 1441. About this time an important discovery of MSS was made at Altobassis. Poggio had by this time retired from active service in the collection of MSS to engage in literary composition, but this discovery aroused all his old enthusiasm. He wrote at once for an inventory. Among the lost works of Cicero that he hopes to find is the *Consolatio* (*Epistt.* VIII. 24 Tonelli). It is difficult to believe that a discovery of a *Consolatio* of Cicero in earlier years could

have remained unknown to Poggio. Poggio was in close communications with Traversari, the only scholar who can be identified with the finding of a *Consolatio*. It seems almost certain that the genuine *Consolatio* was not known in the early Renaissance. Was our *Consolatio* known and regarded as spurious? It is impossible to answer. It seems strange that in the correspondence of the time there should be no reference to any controversy. Possibly the large body of unpublished letters contains the whole story. Yet to my mind, the document belongs to the Renaissance. I cannot agree with Ellis when he says that the style is too classical to have been possible in the Renaissance. A scholar of that period, imperfectly trained and supplied with apparatus, would in my opinion have composed Latin very like this. The presence of accentual *clausulae* would indicate a time when they knew that a quantitative clausule existed, but were not well acquainted with its use. The danger of arguing from silence is well seen in the case of Catullus, to whom really significant references in the Renaissance are rare. The reference in Sicco looks very like, and may well be, a real reference. In the absence of confirmatory evidence it is hard to be sure.

The fondness of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries for forging inscriptions and literary documents is well known. I need only mention the name of Ligorio on the epigraphical side. Ciriacus of Ancona has had a bad reputation (probably largely undeserved) as a forger. Annius of Viterbo published in 1498 seventeen books of histories, said to be those of Fabius Pictor and others. Even Muretus was charged with forging a fragment of Pacuvius (cf. Ellis *Commentary on Catullus*, 2d. ed., pp. 66, 67). Madvig thought he discerned Renaissance influence on the *De orthographia* of Apuleius (*Opusc.* I). In general, see Symonds *Revival of Learning*, p. 156, n. 2, and the reference to Tiraboschi there cited. Most interesting of all for our purpose is the forged epitaph of Tullia (*CIL.* VI. 5, 3593*). While it is not justifiable on such slight evidence to assert a connection, nothing could show with greater clearness Renaissance interest in such subjects as the death of Tullia than this inscription.

Scharff's view, that the end of the fifteenth century was the date of our *Consolatio*, must be accounted a strong possibility. I cannot attempt to conjecture the individual. I am acquainted with no scholar of the period who combined the necessary qualifications, in scholarship and character, though forgery was not so serious a crime in the eyes of the world then as now. Despite this, the most reasonable theory is that this *Consolatio* is the work of an unknown scholar of the Renaissance.

APPENDIX A

CONSOLATIONS AND LAUDATIONS IN THE RENAISSANCE

It would be impossible at this time to relate in full the history of the Renaissance literature of these types; in fact, a separate treatise might be written on this subject. To form an impression of the number of examples of these literary types one need only glance through the indices of such a collection as Muratori's *Scriptores rerum Italicarum*, or through any catalogue of MSS. I shall confine my attention to a few of the most interesting specimens, for the present, reserving the consideration of a wider range of examples for a later paper. Practically all the notable scholars and public men of the Renaissance composed laudations and consolations. I shall confine my examples in general to Poggio, Manetti, and Barzizza, the choice being dictated by especial interest in the form of the work, or in the author.

Space does not permit the complete reproduction of these specimens, many of which are almost inaccessible to American scholars. Among the most conspicuous figures of the Renaissance are Poggio, the collector of MSS, and his friend, Niccolo Niccoli, text critic, and, one might almost say, editor. The latter died in 1437, and Poggio wrote the funeral oration. This may be found complete in Poggio's works, or, summarized and translated, in Shepherd *Life of Poggio*, pp. 299 ff. The contents of the oration are in brief as follows: The Muses, if such an act were consistent with their dignity, would have come down to praise this man. My effort is only to point the way for some more eloquent orator, and to perform the service due a friend. After a *petitio veniae* in familiar form, with more biographical material than an ancient would have admitted, but formally presented, the oration proper begins: his birth, and eulogy of his parents; his studies under Marsilius, his industry and attainments in scholarship, and his generosity. His house was a veritable public library. He was active in bringing new teachers to Florence. Here occurs an interesting and characteristic passage. Poggio had had a violent quarrel with Francesco Filelfo, who was one of the teachers summoned to Florence by Niccolo. The author interrupts his narrative for a thrust at Filelfo, but with an apology for Niccolo: "Tum ultimus omnium Nicolai quoque opera ad nos adiit vir scelestissimus omnium atque impurissimus (quem contumeliae causa nomino) Franciscus Philelphus. Verum Nicolaus, qui scientiae utilitatem quaereret, flagitia ignoraret, communi errore bonorum, qui ceteros ex suo ingenio iudicant, ... deceptus," etc. He continues with Niccolo's

prudentia, humanitas, gravitas, castitas, etc. Looking forward to being of service in the future, as in the past, he arranged at his death to found a public library. He concludes with an apostrophe to his friend, an appeal to the audience, and a promise to keep alive his memory. The resemblance to the rhetorical fashions of the ancients is sufficiently evident. Of particular interest would be a detailed comparison with Bruno's invective against Niccolo, which Poggio answers, almost detail for detail. See Wotke *Wiener Studien* XI. 295 ff. Syncrises are frequent. Notable for its rhetorical form is Poggio's oration for Lorenzo de Medici (*Opp.*, pp. 278 ff., ed. Basil).

The remainder of the half-dozen orations of Poggio we may pass over more briefly. The treatment of virtues is the same throughout. Truly encomiastic in its spirit is the use of the same characteristic in opposite ways: Franciscus, Cardinal of Florence, is praised (*Opp.*, p. 252) for his study of law, while the Cardinal of S. Croce gave up the law for the church. In the former case, law is the most useful study, in the latter, "huius mundi sapientia" is "apud Deum stultitia." The oration for L. Bruno was "dignified, lucid, pathetic, well-proportioned" (Shepherd *op. cit.*, p. 375). This was not delivered, but was written at the request of friends to replace the miserable production of Manetti, the official orator. This oration of Manetti is summarized in Shepherd *op. cit.*, p. 371, note, and for puerility surpasses anything of the kind known to me. A few quotations will suffice. "If the Muses were in the habit of appearing in public, they would have wept for this man, in Latin or in Greek, but as they are not, I, whose only recommendation is that I am a member of the government, have been selected to deliver the *laudatio*, and to crown the corpse." The treatment professes to be orderly, but its symmetry is much marred by digressions. Cicero, who translated from the Greek, and Livy, who wrote history, are both inferior to this man, who did each of these things. Preparing for the coronation, he relates in great detail, through several pages, the entire history of the subject, describing the eight kinds of military crowns, the circumstances under which they were awarded, etc. Having proved Bruno a poet by the amusing rule, "Itaque si quis poeta esse cuperet, quaedam egregia poemata scribat oportet," he proceeds with the coronation. The oration may be found in full in *Cod. Urb.* 387 f., 169 ff.

The productions of Barzizza along this line are partly orations and partly letters, but nowhere is so close an adherence to the rules of rhetoric apparent. The oration for Jacobus de Turre Foroliviensi (*Opp.*, p. 23) is almost without this relation. Extracts follow. "We come here in great numbers, as we did to hear him speak. The literary world grieves most of

all. He surpassed all in scriptural knowledge. His attainments in medicine are described. He knew the works of Galen as well as their author. He is with the blessed. Gratitude demands that we remember him, as I at least shall do." Equally informal, though using some of the consolatory commonplaces, is the consolatory letter addressed to Fr. Barbavaria after the death of Zaninus Riccius (*Opp.*, p. 57): "I have postponed writing because of the difficulty I have found in consoling myself, though, on account of my long life and my study of philosophy, I ought to be able to console myself and others. He showed his greatness especially in despising death. He wished no display of mourning. Let us not seem selfish, or forgetful of the common lot of man. I shall be all the more devoted to you, because you have lost this friend." Of a different sort is the letter to Petrus Marcellus (*Opp.*, p. 85), which is not at all concerned with the deceased, but occupies itself entirely with the praise of the living. More formal than these, but especially noteworthy for its naïveté, is the laudation of Manuel Chrysoloras delivered by Andreas Julianus, who asserts that he is performing a service that by rights belongs to Guarino (Lenfant *Poggiana* II. 327).

APPENDIX B

CLAUSULAE

I print here the *clausulae* of our *Consolatio*, secs. 1–18, without comment. I add, for comparison, the *clausulae* from the first eight sections of the first book of the *Tusculans*, with the *clausulae* indicated, the *clausulae* of about one folio column of Sigonius *De dialogo liber* (*Opp.* VI. 435, ed. 1757), the *clausulae* of about two pages of Barzizza (*Oratio ad pont. Martin* V, *Opp.*, pp. 76 ff.), also without comment.

Consolatio

subvenire calamitati
aliquando nobis ipsis
leviora faciamus
efficere miseriorem
animo valere possis
corporis indiget
parebit imperio
ante nos scripserunt
Xenocrate et Crantore
legimus necessario
antea movebamur
abstergendum colligemus
ipsis medeamur
maerore abducere
quandam quasi vim adferemus
casus patienter ferre
ideoque levius ferendi
reicere audeat
iniustus merito haberetur
iniustitiae condemnat
dubitat appellare
in homine tolerabile
bellare videbitur
multis tractata sunt
ego Crantorem sequor
medicinam complexus est
possis agnoscere
atque incommodorum
plurimae amplectuntur
infimos adrogantia
mercede conflatum
posterorum non familiae
incommoda removebit
seiungi possunt
cum aliquo conferre
in uno agnoscuntur
enumerare
maxime incurrit
particeps et socia est
adversis experitur
anxia et sollicita
tueri non posset
ac deterrere possit
depulsis contraximus
libentissime redemissemus
de me ipso praedicare
ornamento consumpsi
laudabilis est maxime
ac miseriis loquar
ipse senum hominum patefacit
viventem mortuum
atque molestiae
perficere non posse
iuvare non possit
inania sint futura
mihi videor dixisse
generibus hominum loquar
esse negare possum
voluit experiri
exitia immineant

Tusculans

elaborarent
instit*utis et legibus*
lo*quar de re militari*
plus etiam disciplina
gente sunt conferenda
maiori*bus nostris comparanda*
non repugnantes
poeti*cam nos accepimus*
cogniti vel recepti
hominum virtutibus
p*oetas duxisset*
ut scimus Ennium
gloriae responderunt
et Parrhasios fuisse
quae apud quosque improbantur
habitus indoctior
doctri*na putabatur*
terminavimus modum
omni*no Graecis cederetur*
si possumus otiosi
sed non satis eruditis
eloqui non possit
otio et litteris
sibi permitti volunt
illa manabant
arte versari
ha*bere auderemus*
eo genere possem
est declamatio
ambulans disputabam
toti*dem libros contuli*
e*go contra dicerem*
arbitrabatur
quasi narretur
nas*cetur exordium*

Sigonius

explicanda ducamus
Aristotelem intelligimus
qualis investigetur
ac necessariae
doctrinam in dialogo
disputatione tradendam
primus induxerit
disciplinae innixa sit
primum de prima
hae praecipuae duae
consuetudine tracta
ratiocinandi altera
facile intelligit
memoriae commendata
ipsi doctrinae subiret
subsidium compararet
poeta confugeret
figura praestare
diligentissime persequi
diligenter attenderit
facile inveniet
maxime possimus
(See also above, p. 48)

Barzizza

perfectum intuemur
diutissime flagravimus
fundere solebamus
felix nimium aetas
gaudia attulisti
impares celebrent
respicere inceperimus
studium opinamur
sumptibus pepercit
afflictos erigeret
aspectum abhorrentes
otiosam degerent

acquiescere fas sit
interitu cogitarent
animarum pepererint
discrimen magnifecit
esse debemus
gaudium attulerit
antea diem aspeximus
fluctuabamus
versas conspicimus
ascensus videretur
oves peragravimus
effudisse arbitraris

GAYLORD BROS.
MAKERS
SYRACUSE, - N.Y.
PAT. JAN. 21, 1908